LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAR 25 1942
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BV 4355 .M8
Munro, Harry Clyde, 1890-
The pastor and religious
education

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAR 25 1942
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Pastor and Religious Education

HARRY C. MUNRO
Director of Adult Work
International Council of Religious Education

THE ABINGDON PRESS
NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO

Copyright, 1930, by
HARRY C. MUNRO

All rights reserved, including that of translation into foreign languages, including the Scandinavian

Printed in the United States of America

First Edition Printed September, 1930
Second Printing, December, 1933

TO

MY FATHER AND MOTHER

WHO MADE OF MY EARLY HOME

A SCHOOL IN CHRISTIAN LIVING

CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE
FOREWORD ... 7
I. SHOULD THE CHURCH KEEP PACE? ... 11
II. WHY DON'T THEY STAY FOR CHURCH? ... 30
III. HOW CAN THE MINISTER HOLD HIS YOUNG PEOPLE? ... 50
IV. IS THE JUNIOR CHURCH A WAY OUT? ... 78
V. WHAT IS THE CHURCH TRYING TO DO? ... 92
VI. CAN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION REMAIN A LAYMAN'S MOVEMENT? ... 114
VII. DOES A DIRECTOR SOLVE THE PROBLEM? ... 136
VIII. CAN THE MINISTER TAKE ON ANOTHER TASK? 153
IX. THE CHURCH AS A SCHOOL IN CHRISTIAN LIVING ... 171
X. THE PASTOR HIS OWN EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR ... 206

FOREWORD

The Ministerial Alliance of a midwestern city was in session. The question under discussion was "religious education." A veteran of half a century's pastoral experience, honored by all for his achievements, said, "If I had my way about it, I would wipe out the Sunday school. I would abolish this whole program of religious education."

"But," remonstrated one of his colleagues, "what about the Board of Religious Education of your denomination? How would it function without Sunday schools?"

"I would wipe out that board and others like it," responded the veteran. "We have been led too far astray by this religious education from the central evangelistic purpose of the church."

A very successful pastor in an excellent church said enthusiastically, after week-day religious education had been launched in his city, "I tell you, this week-day work is the thing. It won't be long now until we can do the necessary teaching that way and then we can close up the Sunday school and give the church itself a chance on Sunday."

A thoughtful pastor expresses his observation that many good people have a Sunday-school experience of religion. Although church members, they have far more enthusiasm for the Sunday church school[1] than for the church. Naturally, such a situation is not quite satisfactory to the pastor.

---

[1] Throughout this book the term "Sunday school" will be used to indicate the traditional teaching agency of the church, the term "church school" will mean the total modern educational program of a church, and the term "Sunday church school" will refer to the Sunday session of such a program.

Many a minister has the harrowing experience, weekly, of seeing a great company of his people, especially the younger group, turn their backs upon the church, just at the point where he takes charge of the morning program to lead the congregation in worship. He wonders whether there is something wrong with himself, the program, or the people, that he should thus be denied effective contact with so many at the high point in the church's weekly schedule.

A great religious educator goes as far as any minister would in saying: "The complete abolition of the school would be a long step in advance. It is an obsolete institution. Historically, the Sunday school was a lay movement of religious education which formed an alliance with the church. The Sunday-school superintendent has always regarded himself as the head of the institution. The time has come for the church to resume its function of religious education, for the minister to resume his function of educational direction, for the separate institution of a religious school to be abandoned. We need a church and only a church."[2]

For nearly a century and a half the Sunday school developed largely as a layman's enterprise performing an important service for the church, but, except here and there, not receiving a great deal of attention from the clergy. Then, almost suddenly, the traditional Sunday-school movement metamorphosed into a veritable religious educational renaissance. It began to claim a place of chief attention and influence in the life of the church. It developed its own self-conscious profession. Its teeming activities threatened to push the minister to one side, unless he found a place for himself among them.

---

[2] Soares, Theodore Gerald, *Religious Education* (1928), p. 262. Reprinted by permission of The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

For the minister to ignore religious education is no longer possible. To oppose it is a natural first impulse on the part of the minister who finds it seemingly frustrating the program to which he is accustomed and for which he is trained. To use its resources and techniques to further his own purposes and ideals for his congregation, is becoming the attitude of an increasing number of successful ministers.

Whatever may have been the characteristic traditional attitude of the minister toward Sunday-school work, one thing is clear—the minister of to-day is forced into some intelligent and consistent attitude toward religious education, if he is to maintain his place of leadership in the local church program. It is the purpose of the following discussion to assist the pastor in finding his proper place in the educational program of his church.

The bibliographies are purposely limited in order to supply very definite guidance in further reading. They are restricted for the most part to recent publications on the assumption that most pastors will already be familiar with the older works which have value still. Many excellent volumes have been excluded which deal in a general way with the modern church and the pastor's functions and responsibilities in its program. This is not to imply that they are not valuable, but, rather, that the alert pastor will already be familiar with their helpful messages. The bibliographies as well as the treatment itself have sought to deal quite definitely with a particular point of view regarding the pastor's educational function and responsibility.

CHAPTER I

SHOULD THE CHURCH KEEP PACE?

SUPPOSE some twentieth-century Rip van Winkle who had fallen asleep about twenty years ago should suddenly awaken next Saturday evening to find himself standing on the public square of his old home town! His amazement would doubtless far exceed that of his noted prototype. Imagine him rubbing his eyes at the galaxy of electrical advertising and standing aghast amidst the dashing about of high-powered automobiles. What would he make of the barking of the loud speaker and of the "talkie" or of the zoom of the aeroplane overhead, to say nothing of new styles in skirts and skyscrapers! His first impression would probably be that, through some terrible mistake, he had awakened in a different world than the one he had known before his twenty-year nap.

But suppose, unlike the original Rip, he had been a respectable churchman, and he should sleep on through Saturday night and awaken at about eleven o'clock Sunday morning to find himself comfortably seated in his old home church. He might feel quite at home!

The church to-day is in the midst of a world which is changing with confusing and increasing rapidity. The expansion of man's control over the hitherto mysterious and ominous forces of the universe has transformed his whole mode of living. New ways of getting his work done have greatly increased leisure and lightened drudgery, at the same time vastly multiplying productivity. New modes of travel and communication have enlarged his contacts and brought the very world to his doorstep. New means of amusement and self-indulgence have jaded his sensibilities with their glitter and thrill. New ways of personal enrichment and enlargement of life have revealed spiritual potentialities hitherto undreamed. But in it all *change* is the most constant and characteristic note.

Modes of living change more to-day in a decade than they did formerly in centuries. Adjustments as great as those which were once scarcely demanded in the long life of a nation or a race now must be made several times in the life of a single generation. That this confusing condition of change will continue even more rapidly in the future is one of the few certainties toward which we dare look.

The task of the traditional educator was comparatively simple. He had merely to prepare his students to live in the same world in which he himself had grown up—to pass on to them the modes of conduct and the solutions for life's problems which had always been sufficient. Change was so slight as to be negligible.

But the modern educator dare not be nearly so sure of himself. How can he prepare his students for a future which is so largely unpredictable? Who knows what specific skills and knowledge and modes of conduct these students will need, in order to live effectively in the world of two or three decades hence? So the modern educator says that the best he can do to help these boys and girls get ready for that unknown world and life of to-morrow, is to help them live skillfully and richly now. If they develop initiative and resourcefulness in making adjustments to life's demands to-day, we may trust that the unpredictable world of to-morrow will find them courageous and self-reliant, ready to make the best of it, come what may.[1]

With change apparent all about us, with general education adjusting its philosophy so as to accommodate rather than to resist change, with science promising still further to speed the rate of change, and with scarcely an institution or a custom sacred enough to escape the iconoclastic modern; what shall we say of the church? Shall the church change too? Or shall there remain at least one changeless Gibraltar amidst the swirling tides of humanity? Is the church not needed as one place of refuge where pilgrims out of the past may catch their breath and feel momentarily at home?

Religion has always functioned in human experience as a steadying and conserving force. It is the confidence and reassurance growing out of religious faith that gives poise and control to the believer in the midst of whatever uncertainties, or mysteries, or readjustments life forces upon him. If the institutions of religion were as responsive to every whim of popular fancy and every new interest or sensation brought about by our changing order as is the theater, for example, certainly they would fail to serve the real mission of religion in human life. We may rightly expect, therefore, a degree of stability, poise, and continuity in the program of the church which continually lays it under the charge of being out-of-date in a rapidly changing social order. The church can afford to face the charge of being "old-fashioned" better than it can afford to fail in conserving true values and in steadying human waywardness. The church dare not become fickle even though many of its members do.

---

[1] See Kilpatrick, *Education for a Changing Civilization*, The Macmillan Company, publishers, New York.

On the other hand, the Christian religion is far more concerned with ongoing human experience than with mere preservation of the past. Its institutions and their programs, therefore, dare not become dissociated from life with all its changes. A church in which one who belongs to a previous generation would feel "quite at home" may be failing to provide a real religious home for those of its own generation. After all, our concern as church leaders is not so much to provide a refuge for a rudely awakened Rip van Winkle as it is to provide poise and power and guidance to those living the life of to-day. Perhaps Rip should have slept on—or not have gone to sleep in the first place.

The question is not whether the church will undertake to make such adjustments in her program as will enable it to deal with life in a complex and rapidly changing world. Rather, it is a question of discovering just what characteristics of our modern life it is that demand adjustment in the church's program, in what aspects of her program those changes are needed, and in what the adjustments will consist.

The present-day pastor is conscious of several very effective competitors for the attention of his constituency which were unknown to his predecessor a generation ago. The automobile has made it possible for millions to attend the church of their choice with convenience, speed, and comfort, who must formerly have attended at great difficulty if at all. But unfortunately, instead of bringing people in vaster multitudes to the church, the automobile seems to have become one of the most effective means of taking them off on Sunday outings, leaving empty churches behind them. "How can we convert those automobiles?" is many a pastor's problem.

The Sunday paper, potentially a power for general intelligence and culture, has, for uncounted families, set the tone of Sunday reading and thinking at a pagan level and monopolized the hours of Sunday morning once spent in church. Shall the pastor compete for the attention of this constituency by lurid sensationalism?

As a result of the amazing privileges brought to millions of homes by the radio, more good preaching is being heard to-day, no doubt, than ever before. The audiences of several of the most effective pulpiteers of the country have been multiplied by tens of thousands. Yet the radio sermon is not considered an ally by the majority of pastors. For too many of their audience it constitutes an excuse to be absent from their own church and to shirk any real part in the responsibility and fellowship of church work. Whatever value the radio has had in creating a general interest in religion and in disseminating inspiration and guidance through the broadcast sermon, the average pastor has found his task made more difficult and exacting as a result of its unintentional competition.

Popular amusements, more widely accessible and more skillfully purveyed to the public than ever before, are more generously patronized, including a greatly increased patronage by church people. Shall the church install its own motion pictures and dances, entering openly into competition with commercial types? Can it compete successfully? If it does, what has it gained?

The vastly increased productivity of modern power-driven industry has produced luxury and leisure with their attendant self-indulgence and ease. Inevitably moral tissue tends to become flabby and religion to lose its virility and heroic qualities. Pleasure becomes an end in itself and a final justification for any conduct. In a young people's church convention a fine-appearing lad was to speak on the subject, "The Mind of Christ in Our Social Life." He said that he would deal with the subject by a defense of modern youth, which has been so much slandered. After justifying high-school fraternities and dancing by saying that all were usually judged by the worst, he disposed of the matter of girls smoking cigarettes in these words: "A girl smokes for one of two reasons, either to be smart or because she likes it. If she smokes just to be smart, she'll soon give it up. So why worry about it? If she smokes for pleasure, let her smoke!" This concluded the speech, and it went unchallenged among a group of Christian youth and their leaders! The stern challenge of the gospel of Christ falls as a strange tongue upon such ears. The pastor wonders whether he should cultivate a vocabulary more in harmony with the age or whether he must risk being considered "old fogey" and cry out in protest against such pagan standards.

But there is a deeper problem than that constituted by the increasing attractiveness of the agencies or interests competing with the church for the attention and allegiance of her constituency. The church of to-day *has a new type of mind with which to deal.* Great as have been the changes which have come over our modes of living in the last generation, our modes of thinking have changed still more.

In fact the whole dazzling structure of modern civilization rests back upon a new mode of thinking, the achievement of which alone made this gala day possible. It was not until man learned to measure with extreme accuracy and minuteness, to experiment with far-seeing and undiscourageable purpose, to gather data with infinite pains and patience, to interpret these data with insight and imagination, and to use the results of the tireless efforts of predecessors and coworkers—it was not until man learned to think *scientifically* that our modern world of magic became possible. Only as men gained the courage to challenge every cherished superstition, to doubt every accepted notion, and to root the word "impossible" out of their vocabularies, did they lay hold of the secrets which unlocked these mighty forces of the universe and enslaved them again in the service of man. It is the scientific method, which is primarily a mode of thinking, a type of mind, that has built for us our fairyland of luxuries and thrills.

The scientific method was for a time the possession of a few specialists whose uncanny feats amazed and puzzled us. Our general mode of thinking was not greatly affected thereby. To-day, however, the most efficient and extensive educational system ever developed is busily engaged in putting the growing generation into possession of at least the general patterns of the scientific method. The type of mind with which the church of the future must deal is one that is inquisitive, critical, analytical, and logical, rather than credulous and submissive to arbitrary intellectual authority.

Modern education is quite confident of its ability to develop a general national type of mind. Evidences of the power of the modern educational method are not far to seek. "What you would put into the state, first put into the school," was the slogan of William von Humbolt, Prussian minister of education. On this principle the schools of a great nation of peace-loving, docile, and industrious people were dedicated to the creation of the military mind. In a generation the nation was converted into a mighty military camp with a national morale and a will-to-conquest which were the admiration and despair of the civilized world.

Benjamin Kidd, in his book, *The Science of Power*, uses the above and similar illustrations to show the invincible power of education to create any kind of social order its leaders may set before themselves. He concludes that any ideal may be realized or any dream fulfilled in the life of the oncoming generation if they are but permitted to take it up as a part of their social heritage through education. Since we have a highly efficient educational system reaching all but a negligible portion of our children and youth, the mental type of the future is largely being determined by it. This system is increasingly scientific in its viewpoint, method, and aims, and will inevitably produce a scientifically minded generation.

Now, so far, the scientific method has been chiefly concerned with physical forces. Its conquests have been largely in the material realm. It is not surprising, therefore, that the scientific method and type of mind have come to be popularly identified with a materialistic philosophy of life. It has even been frequently assumed that the scientific method is restricted to dealing with physical entities or material things. The mechanistic behaviorists in psychology seem unwilling to grant the existence of anything except the physical basis of consciousness. They stigmatize as "unscientific" any attempt to deal with data of human experience which are not physical in nature. Due to the preoccupation of science so far largely with data of a material nature, it is not surprising that the scientific type of mind has tended toward a materialistic philosophy.

For the time being, at least, we must grant that the rapid dissemination of the scientific type of mind has embarrassed organized religion and made the task of the minister vastly more difficult. Even though this be a temporary situation, this new type of mind with which the church of the immediate future must deal constitutes a problem greater than that of the many hindrances to regular church attendance.

"For the time being," we say, for who shall dare to dream of the accomplishments of the scientific method in the realm of the spirit if the ingenuity and resources which have been invested in the physical sciences to exploit nature were to be invested in the psychical sciences to discover and capitalize the resources of human nature? Why should we doubt that discoveries in this spiritual realm are before us just as revolutionary and as rewarding as have been corresponding discoveries in the physical? The field is more difficult of exploration and the data are more elusive. Progress will likely be slow. Yet we already know enough about mental hygiene and psychiatry to revolutionize criminology and transform our whole attitude toward the sinner and the outcast. It took medical science to dissociate physical disease from guilt for sin.[2] What might happen if mental disease were similarly understood scientifically and so treated, without necessarily being bound up with guilt?

While, therefore, the first outcome of the rapidly spreading tendency to think scientifically may be a materialistic philosophy of life and a paganized social order, we are all too much in debt to the scientific method to decry it. And it does not yet appear what the same type of mind, applied exhaustively to the realm of the spiritual, may accomplish. Be that as it may, the fact remains, the church has to deal with a generation who have gained at least some proficiency in scientific thinking, materialistic though it be. What are the implications of this fact for the program and method of the church?

There are at least four attitudes which the church may take, and various churches are taking, toward the modern type of mind.

1. The church may conceive of religion as a system of belief and practice which is an entity within

---

[2] Note: "Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?"

itself, and which may go on the even tenor of its way with little regard to the currents of thought and life prevalent in the world at large. Religion thus becomes sort of a closed system, once for all delivered to the saints. By it the believer is saved from the world in which he lives, but the world itself goes to the devil who owns it, or at least possesses it. Religion is thus a "scheme of redemption" by which, through a prescribed transaction, the individual is taken care of in the future life.

A fire escape is built on the outside of a house to be used in case worse comes to worst, but inside the house are the much more comfortable staircases and doorways for everyday use. So religion is a system attached to life for emergency purposes, to be kept in good repair and ready in case something should happen, but not to be used much in everyday traffic. Whatever may go on in life as a whole, however currents of thought and modes of living may change, this type of religion "stands hitched." It has no problems of adjustment or adaptation. It is, indeed, a complacent and satisfying sort of religion, yielding an assurance and peace of mind not easily gained otherwise. Little wonder millions cling to such a fire-escape cult in the name of Christianity.

2. At the opposite extreme the church may conceive of religion as simply a quality of life as a whole, so interrelated with all aspects of living as to be subject to every important change. But so conceived, religion seems to lack any real substance or function. Unless it is able to rise above the vicissitudes of life and assert its own constant purposes and ideals, it fails to give personality that

integrity, poise, and self-control which, as religion, it should. Perhaps, after all, there was something "once for all delivered to the saints," even though it were not a mere closed formula of self-preservation. If we cannot afford to have religion set apart from and unaffected by life, neither can we afford to make it a mere sentimental way of looking at our changing experiences.

3. A mediating position between these extremes would be to hold tenaciously to the eternal purpose and message of the religion of Jesus, while being quite willing to change the program and method by which to realize and fulfill them, as modes of living and modes of thinking change around us. This enables religion to fulfill its function as a factor of guidance and control in experience, while keeping its thought patterns and activities closely related to current experience.

But it is not always easy to distinguish between that which is essential to the message and purpose of Jesus and those vehicles of method and program which embody and convey it. We may be certain that if Jesus is worthy the place of authority in religion which Christians give him, he made nothing absolutely essential in his message and purpose with which later discoveries in any realm are inconsistent. The embarrassments which theology has suffered in the scientific atmosphere of our day are due to mistaking the husk for the kernel of his message rather than to any real inconsistency. If we have the courage to subject our method and program to whatever reconstruction the present day demands, we may be assured of sufficient remaining message and purpose to give the same guidance and poise to life which the Christian religion has always given. Our tenacity for the things of Christ must become far greater than our tenacity for the things of men before we are able to carry this mediating attitude through.

4. Having determined to hold to the eternal message and purpose of Christ while subjecting our methods and programs to whatever changes the currents of a new day demand, we can go still further in dealing with this new type of mind. The church as such can and should take an active hand in creating the type of mind with which it will have to deal in the immediate future. Why leave this entirely to the public school and the uncertain influences of home and community? The church cannot, even if it would, work successfully against the public school in its creative task. It must work with the school and in the same direction, but it may go much further.

The difficulty with the materialistic view of life is not that it is essentially wrong. It is merely incomplete, fragmentary. It is as large a view as public education has generally achieved, but public-school men are seriously and devoutly seeking to discover the means of carrying it much further.

The following excerpt from the Sixth Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association is one evidence of this. The subject of this report is "The High School Curriculum." The quotation below is from Chapter II, on "The Objectives of Secondary Education." The fourfold objectives of high-school education are outlined as follows:

"1. To promote the development of an understanding and an adequate evaluation of the self.

"2. To promote the development of an understanding and an appreciation of the world of nature.

"3. To promote the development of an understanding and an appreciation of organized society.

"4. To promote the development of an appreciation of the force of law and of love that is operating universally."

Then the fourth is further expounded as follows: "Man craves more than a knowledge of himself, of nature, and of organized society. He hungers and he thirsts after righteousness. Knowing his own imperfections, he feels that somewhere there is perfection. The great universe calls to his spirit, and unless he ignorantly or willfully closes his ears, he hears the voice of God. No question of theology or ecclesiastical polity is involved here. The individual soul reaches out to orient itself in the universe and to find its place of labor and of rest. No partial view suffices. Only the view of the whole will make it possible to interpret the meaning of day-by-day experience. When this orientation takes place, life assumes poise, dignity, grandeur. Otherwise its striving, its struggles, its achievements seem trivial and insignificant.

"No greater task rests upon the secondary school than to help its pupils to find their God. How this is to be done is the greatest of problems. Of one thing only are we sure: We cannot solve this problem by ignoring it."

Increasingly public-school men are becoming concerned that this oncoming generation shall be spiritually minded. If the schools had the full and effective co-operation of the churches in creating the mind of the next generation, the outcome would be vastly more to the satisfaction of both. The next generation will think in scientific thought patterns. But if that means that they will be solely materialistic, it is not because the public school wills it so, but rather because the church has failed to take a hand in the task of education, and the indispensable resources of religion have been lacking.

Now, the ordinary church program, in which the minister invests most of his time and energy and the congregation most of its interest and money, is well adapted to maintaining and propagating the "fire-escape" type of religion described as attitude number one. Indeed, the traditional adult-centered church program of preaching and revival meetings originated and is ideally designed for just that purpose. Many a minister and church would be ready eagerly to embrace the viewpoint expressed as attitudes (3) and (4). But when it came to reconstructing the method and program after modern patterns so as to take a real hand in shaping the mind of the coming generation, they would shrink back in terror, once they realized the proportions of the task.

The church's program, if it is to become a determining factor in the developing mind of the oncoming generation, must necessarily center in the needs and welfare of childhood and youth. Its provision to meet the religious needs of adults must become more rather than less effective. But the minister and the church, while continuing to provide for adults, must become child-centered in consciousness. The total church program must revolve around the growing life and responsive minds and hearts of its youth. In planning its buildings, in distributing its budget, in employing its professional leadership, their welfare must be considered first, not last.

This is asking the church to do no more than the community as a whole, of which it is a part, has, in many cases, done. Many an American community spends more of the funds for which it taxes itself on the single cause of education than on all other community enterprises combined. With all the tremendous costs for police and fire protection, public utilities of various sorts, and the usually extravagant city government, the two hundred and fifty largest American cities still spend about thirty-four per cent of their total budgets on the single cause of education. The cold-hearted city is more child-centered in its consciousness than most of the churches within it, which bear witness to Him who "set the child in the midst."

To be sure, the public-school budget is greatly increased in proportion by the fact that its leadership is employed, while that of the church's educational program is almost entirely voluntary. But if the church became convinced to-morrow that, by employing a staff of church-school leaders, it could parallel public-school efficiency, would it employ them? Not very likely, for it is still difficult to get churches even to share in the cost of training their educational leaders who give voluntarily of their time and effort. And there are few churches so child-centered that if professional leadership cannot be employed for both youth and adulthood, the needs of youth will take precedence over those of their elders.

A church which spends ten to twenty-five per cent of its funds on its program for childhood, in a community which spends thirty-five to sixty per cent of its funds for the same childhood, has little opportunity to take an effective hand in shaping the mind of childhood, or in winning its allegiance.

Our present social order places tremendous emphasis on education. For the vast majority of youth education is the dominant concern of the dozen years during which mental habits are being formed and attitudes are being fixed. The only hope of the church for a real share in that process is through an educational method and program equally efficient, equally extensive, and equally youth-centered. To provide this will so tax the total resources of the church as to render her entire program youth-centered.

When the church undertakes to parallel public education with a church-school program of such scope and quality as to be a real factor in shaping the mind of youth, no educational makeshift will suffice. In her educational viewpoint, in the skill and preparation of her leadership, and in her willingness and ability to use the scientific method, and maintain the scientific attitude, the church dare not fall far below the public school. In fact, the educational task of the church is so much more difficult of attainment due to her loftier aims, that, if there is any difference, it should be rather in favor of the church than to her discredit.

The average church program to-day falls far below this ideal. However, great strides are being made. The rate of improvement in religious education during the last two decades has certainly been more rapid than that in public education. We must remember, however, that the public school in actual practice falls far below the ideals of its educational prophets, and we are likely on the eve of rapid and widespread improvement in general educational practice. It is poor consolation that church schools are improving more rapidly than public schools, when they still suffer at so many points by comparison.

It would be folly and apostasy for the church to attempt merely to reflect the day in which we live. The church is trustee of an eternal purpose and message which it must attempt to realize and propagate in this rapidly moving day. Whether the task be easy or difficult, there can be no question about its mandatory character. Every disciple of the Great Teacher bears this commission.

It would be equally foolish and faithless for the church to seek to carry out its function by any other than a method adapted to our own day. Education, which has become both an art and a science, is the method of social progress and individual development characteristic of our day. Only as the method and program of the church keep pace with those characteristic of the social order which it is seeking to transform through the eternal message and purpose of Christ, will it be true to its trust. And this obligation has serious and far-reaching implications for the minister, as we shall see.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Artman, J. M., and Jacobs, J. A., "Foreseeing a Religious Educational Program for a Local Church," *Religious Education*, October, 1929, pp. 752-760.

Betts, George H., *The New Program of Religious Education*, The Abingdon Press, Chapters I and II.
Beaven, A. W., *Putting the Church on a Full Time Basis*, Foreword. Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc.
Kidd, Benjamin, *The Science of Power*, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
Kilpatrick, William Heard, *Education for a Changing Civilization*, New York: The Macmillan Company.
Randall, John Herman, Jr., *Our Changing Civilization.* Stokes.
Soares, Theodore G., *Religious Education*, University of Chicago Press, Chapters II, VI, VII.
Shaver, Erwin L., *Present-Day Trends in Religious Education*, Boston: The Pilgrim Press, Chapters I, III, IV.

CHAPTER II

WHY DON'T THEY STAY FOR CHURCH?

While our modern Rip van Winkle might feel quite at home in the church service of his old home church, a number of surprises likely await him if he awakens in time for the Sunday church school. Graded lessons in most of the classes have replaced the old Uniform series. The pictures used in the lower grades are real reproductions of art masterpieces, skillfully done. The old question and answer and "verse about" method has been replaced here and there by a much freer type of pupil participation. Enterprises of pupil activity may be observed. There is a serious attempt at real worship in some of the programs. The school is organized by carefully graded age-group departments and classes, rather than as a mass assembly of all ages, breaking up into miscellaneous classes. More than likely a part of the building has been remodeled or a new school building built to accommodate the reconstructed program.

Of course there are many churches which have made decided improvements in the program of the church proper. There are thousands of Sunday schools which are to-day about what they were twenty years ago, if, indeed, they are as effective. The country over, however, it is not too much to say that there has been far more rapid improvement in religious education than in church work as a whole. Whether or not all the change has been real improvement, there has at least been an aggressive and experimental attitude in church-school work, seeking to keep it abreast of the times. In other words, that phase of the church's total program which is under voluntary and, for the most part, untrained lay leadership has been continually undergoing progressive reconstruction in an attempt better to serve the needs of its own day and realize its aims. That phase of the church's total program in which it invests the majority of its funds, which is for the most part central in its consciousness, and for which it employs full-time professionally trained leadership, seems to be most static and least susceptible to changes better adapting it to a rapidly moving world.

It would be a gross injustice to the ministry to allow the severe criticism implied by the above statement to stand unchallenged. As a matter of fact, the minister in many cases should receive most of the credit for stimulating, initiating, and seeing through the improvements which have been made in the church-school program. Furthermore, many a minister longs, and has longed, to effect improvements in the organization, methods, and program of the church proper, but meets with stolid inertia, if not active resistance, on the part of the officers and influential members of the church. The minister thus comes to bear quite unjustly the embarrassment of being identified with the least progressive phase of the church's program, while those phases apparently under voluntary lay leadership are "up and coming."

One reason for the conservatism of that part of the program with which the minister is identified is that it is chiefly an adult program. The educational agencies, however, are much more largely concerned with childhood and youth. In fact, progress is evident almost exclusively in the programs of the younger groups. Adult church-school work shows about the same degree of inertia as does the program of the church proper. The church, therefore, in so far as it has insisted upon identifying its minister with an adult program, has made him apparently responsible for one which is strongly resistant to change.

Another reason for the inertia of the church proper is that institutional consciousness centers there. The older and stronger institutions become, the more self-complacent and inert they are. That phase of the program with which the minister is identified symbolizes "the church." Subordinate or affiliated agencies bear no such weight of dignity and responsibility. Therefore, much less is involved in any proposed change in their organization or methods or program. For example, the basis of membership in a church-school class or department might be radically changed without creating much disturbance. It might never come to the ears of the church officers. But try changing the basis of membership in the "church" and see what happens! It is readily apparent why some of its educational agencies keep their programs and methods more abreast of the times than does "the church" itself.

For the above reasons also the resources of the congregation are lavished upon the "church services" in the attempt to center the interest and attendance of the constituency there. Its professional leadership is employed largely on the basis of his "drawing power" to these services, either as a pulpiteer, or a "good mixer," or both. His success is measured chiefly by the attendance he is able to secure at these services and the number of additions to the membership roll of the church proper. His ability as a worker with youth is an added advantage and is rated largely by the number of young people seen by the adults in attendance upon the "regular church services." Certainly, in what it requires of its employed leadership, and the way in which it uses his time and talents, the average church makes a very strong bid for "church" attendance.

The "church service" is given the most favored place in the Sunday schedule. Rarely would its interests be sacrificed to give a more favorable time to the Sunday church school, but not infrequently are the interests of the Sunday church school subordinated to the welfare of the "church service" in the schedule.

In its investments other than for leadership, such as those for building and equipment, for flowers, and for music, the strongest bid is made by the church for attendance upon its "regular services." In publicity and prominence in the total program, emphasis is placed here.

No criticism whatever is implied in these observations. They are made simply to call attention to the degree in which the average church concentrates its resources upon the "regular church services" in an attempt to attract its constituency to them. And yet in spite of the great advantage which this gives the "church" as over against the

"Sunday school" there are thousands of Sunday church schools whose attendance exceeds that of the church with which they are affiliated.

There are several reasons why the Sunday school or church school has often been more successful in winning attendance than the church, in spite of the great apparent advantages of the latter. The church and pastor usually would like to see all ages worshiping together in the church service, but seldom has the church program made an effective appeal to as wide an age range as has the Sunday church school program. So the potential constituency of the latter is much the larger.

Although the leadership of the Sunday church school is almost always much inferior in its ability and training to the pastor, the greater flexibility of its program and its greater freedom from the inertia of tradition and institutional consciousness have kept it more responsive to popular interest and changing needs. It often seems more "alive" than the church.

The Sunday church school has developed organizational loyalties and attendance devices, often at the risk of very questionable motives, which, however, have been effective in promoting attendance. People are interested in the things for which they carry responsibility and in which they have maximum opportunity for active participation. In this respect the technique of the Sunday church school has usually been much better than that of the church. There has been a tendency also for the Sunday church school to duplicate some of the program elements of the church, making people feel that they did not need both. In these respects the

Sunday church school has frequently been an effective though unintentional competitor with the church.

So we have the setting for one of the most harrowing and baffling experiences which comes weekly to many a minister whose Sunday church school meets before the church service. The point at which he, the employed professional leader of the church, takes charge of the situation and begins that phase of the program upon which most care and expense have been lavished, is the occasion for a general exodus. Many of those who turn their backs upon him and upon the service of worship in which he seeks to bring them into fellowship with the Divine are youth, to be sure, but this is poor consolation. What of the future? Then there are often a sufficient sprinkling of adults—even teachers and parents among them—to wring the conscientious pastor's heart. To be sure, there are many who come only for the church service, perhaps enough to take the places of the others, but the pastor cannot but lament that exodus which cuts off such an important part of his congregation from participation in the full "experience of churchmanship."

The situation is little better if Sunday church school follows church, for the pastor must still witness the arrival of many just at the point where he yields leadership to others, and he wonders wherein the program for which he is responsible has failed in attractiveness or in serving felt needs.

In desperation some pastors have wished that the Sunday church school might be abolished, leaving only the church, freed from at least one of its competitors. Others have hoped and prophesied that week-day religious education would justify the abolition of the Sunday church school, leaving the church proper free from its competition on Sunday. A much larger number, with better grace, have tried by one means or another to build up church attendance out of the Sunday church school constituency.

One of the most common devices is the so-called "unified service." This is not to be confused with the truly unified program to be considered later. It consists of eliminating the usual intermission between Sunday church school and church. Instead of having a benediction at the end of the closing Sunday church school assembly, the Doxology or a hymn of worship is sung and, Presto! we are in the midst of the church service, and there is no convenient time to leave.

A seventeen-year-old boy in a summer conference class wrote a paper on "Changes I Would Like to See in the Program of Our Church." This is how the so-called "unified service" which had been tried by his pastor looked to him: "Not very long ago he [the pastor] decided to make us stay for church. So instead of having general assembly before Sunday school he held it after Sunday school and refused to let any one leave the church building until after the sermon was over. Primaries, Beginners, and all youth were in church that Sunday, but we did not worship. He had advanced toward young people in the wrong way. A great change could be made in our pastor." An extreme case, to be sure, but a warning to those who seek by so simple a device to trick people into "staying for church."

Another plan for building church attendance out of Sunday church school constituency is that of awards for church attendance, given in connection with Sunday church school work. The "graded credit systems," at least for Juniors and Intermediates, usually include this feature, and some rather elaborate award systems based on church attendance alone are available. Doubtless, regular church attendance is desirable and worthy of recognition, but its values depend almost entirely upon the motives prompting it. The church service itself must be both attractive and intrinsically worth while to a boy or girl if regular attendance is to have much spiritual and educational value. In fact, a lasting aversion may be developed toward church services by sitting through them, enduring boredom and annoyance for the sake of an award or simply to make a good record.

One of the most common methods of appeal to the younger group by the pastor is the story sermon, or children's sermon. This is a five-minute sermonette usually before the "regular sermon." Sometimes this is delivered to the audience at large among whom children are presumably scattered. More frequently the children are in a group near the front of the chapel and the minister addresses the group. In either case the children's sermon is enjoyed and appreciated by the adults at least as much as the "regular sermon." They usually share the pastor's satisfaction in providing something helpful and appropriate for the little ones.

Obviously, the "children's sermon" has certain values. It is a definite recognition of the needs and rights of children and of their participation in the service. At least they are made to feel that they "belong."

The sermon may have real intrinsic value supplementing and re-enforcing the other teaching they get and helping them with guidance and inspiration in learning to live the Christian life.

Attracted to the service by this bit of it which is especially for them, the children may participate in other parts of the program, learning the experience of worship with the whole church family and learning to appreciate some of the aids to worship. We have frequent evidence that children enter far more really into the experience of worship on such occasions than we might think. The feeling life is less sharply differentiated or graded among age groups than is the intellectual life. The heart may travel ways which the mind does not fully comprehend.

Such participation is of distinct value in developing a church consciousness. This contact with the pastor is deeply significant in making them feel that he is "our pastor" and that this is "our church." That children are thus attracted to the pastor and attached to the church, has probably more value than the intrinsic worth of the pastor's homily. An interesting story, well told, is worth many sermonettes or platitudinous admonitions.

The market is well supplied with books of story sermons or object talks, which have actually been used on such occasions. Whether or not a busy pastor would buy a book of regular adult sermons and repreach them one by one to his congregation, there is evidence that the practice is followed occasionally in the case of children's sermons. Perhaps children are less likely to catch their pastor at this than adults, but the ethics are no better in the one case than in the other.

These books of children's sermons do serve, however, to indicate the type of preaching which is being done during the "children's five minutes." The spiritual and educational merit of such material, as well as the effectiveness of its pedagogical method, should be evaluated by the same standards governing other curriculum provided for children. Having reviewed several volumes of them, in the light of accepted canons of curriculum evaluation, the writer is forced to the conclusion that their educational merit averages much lower than the graded church-school curriculum in general use in the modern Sunday church school. This opinion is substantiated by a study made a few years ago by the Religious Education Association.[1]

The ministers who contributed to the symposium in which story-sermons to children were evaluated were confident of very satisfactory results. Illustrations were given to show that the lessons really "got over" to the children. There was a feeling on the part of these ministers that the children's sermon was very much worth while.

An analysis of some forty volumes of story-sermons by religious educational specialists skilled in curriculum evaluation, however, resulted in very unfavorable findings. Particularly was the characteristic use of the analogy and the object lesson found highly objectionable. Illustrations showing bad results and total misapprehension on the part of children were given to match the illustrations given by ministers of the supposed effectiveness of the sermons. On the whole, the story-sermon both in content and method cannot be rated very high by educational standards. It should be said that these standards are based on far wider observation and much more adequate scientific data than the opinion of the preacher that he is really getting his message over. The pastor undertaking to use the story-sermon, therefore, will need to improve greatly on material in print, in order to equal the classroom work with which these children are provided.

---

[1] See *Religious Education*, December, 1924.

There are other serious weaknesses besides the inferior content of the ordinary story-sermon and the pedagogical viewpoint from which it is presented. Children may be patronized rather than being respected as real participants in the church service. This attitude will counteract much of the sense of "belonging" which is one of the objects of the special sermon for them. Furthermore, children need far more to be *lived with* than to be *preached at* in gaining a right attitude toward the church, the pastor, and the Christian way of life. The futility of much of the preaching to adults is sufficiently evident to discourage using the same method to achieve desired changes in children.

If the children leave the sanctuary after the pastor has given them their five minutes of recognition, the unwholesome psychology of the situation is that the "real church" does not belong to them after all. They were merely visiting it. If they stay on during an hour in which their presence is ignored both by the choice of materials used and the manner of the leaders, it is probably worse than to have left. Then they *know* that the church is really not the concern of children, for most of it is boresome and uninteresting. On the whole, except under the leadership of a rare personality, and with adjustments made in the entire program, the "children's sermon" hardly justifies the place it has gained. Children need participation in the total church, but it should be real and not on the basis of a patronizing five minutes.

A very common method of using the Sunday church-school situation and appeal to help strengthen the pastor's hold on the potential adult constituency of the church, is through the adult class, usually a men's class taught by the pastor. While, of course, the intrinsic value of the lesson which the pastor teaches or the sermonette which he delivers, is to be granted, most of these classes are launched with the idea of "reaching" a group who do not come to hear the pastor preach, and who may ultimately become attracted to the church proper by the contacts which the class affords. It is questionable whether many ministers would launch the adult class in the first place or would continue to give of their valuable time and effort to it, if it were not in the hope that attendance upon the church services themselves would thereby be built up. The success of the pastor's class is measured ordinarily by its effectiveness in strengthening the church as a whole.

And well it may be. Some of these classes develop organizational loyalties and "class-consciousness" which militate against the interests of the church as a whole, causing jealousy, friction, and disunity. Certainly, if the man who is employed to serve the needs of the entire church gives an important block of his time and energy to a special group, it ought to be to the benefit rather than the injury of the church at large. If the adult class is the best means available for the pastor to strengthen his whole church, he should give himself to it. Seldom, however, are its apparent advantages realized, and certainly there are strong and valid reasons against this use of the pastor's time and ability.

If the pastor's adult class becomes large enough to justify monopolizing his time for the Sunday church-school hour, it will become a small congregation instead of a class. The only practicable method will be that of lecture, and the pastor will soon find himself preparing and delivering what, to all essential purposes, is an additional sermon. Now, those who prefer to hear him at ten o'clock under the name of a Sunday church-school class, rather than at eleven o'clock under the name of the church, may do so. The pastor is now competing with himself, probably sharper competition than anyone else would give him. Those who attend both sessions are likely to be helped little, if any, more than they would be by one, since it is unlikely that any but an extraordinary pastor will make distinctively different contributions in the two sessions, week in and week out. He is almost certain to lack freshness of appeal the second time they hear him.

Very few men can address an adult group shortly before the morning worship and sermon without weakening their effectiveness in the latter program. With the other competition which he must face, the average minister would better adopt the policy of "fewer and better sermons" than to take on additional responsibilities of a similar kind. No minister can afford to weaken his ministry before the whole congregation just for the sake of a group who prefer to hear him under the guise of a teacher rather than as a preacher. If the man power of his church would get back of him in his regular congregational ministry as they do in promoting a men's class, the class might not be necessary. If one thing is needed to-day, it is to magnify the pulpit ministry above all the chores which the pastor may do to build up this or that special organization. If the pastor has the backing to make his pulpit ministry the great and successful vehicle of his prophetic message, he will not need to catch vagrant opportunities for a hearing among adults elsewhere. If his pulpit ministry cannot be made the vehicle of his message to his adult constituency, it is a question whether any number of makeshift hearings will retrieve the situation.

Elsewhere we must deal with responsibilities which the pastor unquestionably has to childhood and youth in his congregation, making the dedication of the Sunday church-school hour to adult groups impossible. The average pastor gives most of his time and energy to meeting the needs of adults, through preaching, worship, and pastoral calling. For one brief hour the childhood and youth of his congregation are assembled in Sunday church school. It is difficult to treat with moderation the selfishness of adults who would insist upon monopolizing him for their class during that one brief period which is the pastor's only opportunity for contact with that great part of his congregation out of which the church of the future is growing. Pastor and people alike are, indeed, shortsighted, who seek to strengthen the church by monopolizing the minister for adult needs exclusively.

The auxiliaries of the church have grown up to meet needs not provided for in the "regular church program." But as these bits of special program provision get under way, they tend to expand and become more general. Overlapping ensues, and soon they are competing with "the church" itself. Program elements are duplicated by several agencies and the individual may take his choice. Whether he chooses wisely or not, many a church member decides to give his major allegiance to one of the auxiliaries rather than to the church as such. This is frequently due to the fact that the auxiliary organization places greater definite responsibility upon him. However it may be explained, the unfortunate outcome is a dissipation of loyalties and a weakening of at least that part of the program for which the minister is chiefly responsible.

The pastor who seeks really to build a local church program for the spiritual development of his people meets another great obstacle in these auxiliary organizations. Most of them sustain responsible relationships with national or international overheads, some denominational, some non-denominational, and some interdenominational. While many earnest attempts are being made to co-ordinate the policies and programs of these various overheads, they still project into the local church heterogeneous fragments of program, frequently overlapping, sometimes glaringly inconsistent, and always confusing and dissipating in their influence upon any central church loyalty. Some of these overheads have become institutionalized to the extent that they assiduously cultivate loyalty to themselves, while voicing slogans of loyalty to the church. Others, such as missionary overheads, seem to find the cultivation of such agency loyalty necessary in order to secure indispensable financial support.

Let us give these organizations full credit for the noble causes which they have championed, and for the enrichment which they have brought into the life of church members and the program of the church. What of youth in the church, had it not been for the pioneering of Christian Endeavor and the Epworth League? When would the church have achieved a conscience on missions, had it not been for missionary societies; or on temperance, without temperance societies? The Sunday school still champions the child's spiritual birthright, in the face of stolid indifference on the part of many churches and church officials. Each of these agencies arose to meet a great need to which the church was indifferent. If the method by which they were forced to do their work has finally created problems or the church, they are the fruitage of her own earlier indifference to some essential aspects of Christian living.

In many a church, however, their pioneering work has been done and pastor and people alike are alert to the essentials of a complete Christian program. In such churches these agencies should rejoice to see their own aims and purposes embodied and carried on in a great comprehensive church program, rendering a multiplicity of agencies not only unnecessary but positively detrimental to the larger good.

Intelligent interest and responsible participation in the world-wide missionary enterprise is an indispensable experience for every Christian. His earliest contact with the church and his church membership in and of itself ought ideally to provide him this experience. When they do not, he ought to join some auxiliary agency which will provide it. This makes his "missionary education" an "elective" or optional aspect of his religion. He may not join the special organization and yet rank as a Christian and a church member. As when registering for a hotel room, to quote Dr. T. H. P. Sailer, he may have his religion "with or without," according to his tastes or the state of his finances. To identify missions with a special organization which one joins in addition to joining the church, is to make missions an "elective" in the Christian curriculum. Certainly, Jesus never meant to give it that status. Strangely enough, many who mean to be the best friends and most ardent advocates of missions, seek to give it just that standing. They prefer not to recognize the missionary element as present anywhere except in such a special agency.

Any aspect of Christianity which is sufficiently important to justify a special organization to promote it and provide it in case the church is neglecting it, is important enough to be given a vital place in the program of the church itself. As soon as it has won that place, the work of the special agency is done. It ought to rejoice in its good work and yield up its identity. If instead it becomes institutionalized and goes on, it becomes the real enemy of the cause for which it was started, since its continued existence implies that this cause, after all, is not an integral part of the total church program. Furthermore, as long as its membership is not coextensive with that of the whole church, it is implying the denial of the advantages of this particular phase of Christianity to those who do not join it in addition to joining the church.

To have various special and elective or optional agencies carrying essential aspects of the Christian enterprise is to impoverish the program of the church itself. Those who join the church, and only the church, are provided but a partial or an emasculated Christian experience. The church which provides only this partial spiritual diet, expecting its members to gather essential elements elsewhere, need not be surprised at widespread malnutrition, since many are bound to assume that the church itself furnishes all the essentials, as it should.

A symmetrical, well-balanced Christian personality will develop out of a symmetrical, well-balanced experience of Christian living. Such an experience will not be provided except by a well-balanced and well-co-ordinated program. The more organizations with different overheads and special purposes there are engaged in supplying this program in fragmentary portions, the less likely is a given individual to get a well-proportioned experience.

Most ministers are harassed by the failure of the present typical church at this point. Not only are they concerned that many people do not attend the preaching service. Many who do attend it do little else to develop Christian personalities. The question is not simply, "Why don't they stay for church?" Rather, it is, "Why don't they seek a larger and richer Christian experience in all available channels?" We must return to this problem later.

Three alternatives are open to the minister in the typical church. There are many examples of those accepting each alternative.

First, the minister may continue to lead and direct the "church" in the narrower sense, making his sermons as effective as possible, but still serving only a portion of those who ought to look to him as pastor. He will see the energies and allegiance of the others dissipated among a multiplicity of organizations and programs. Particularly will he find himself forfeiting the leadership of childhood and youth—the potential church of the future.

Or he may find in all these organizations and programs opportunities for his own leadership and influence. He may rush madly from one committee or social event or devotional meeting to another, trying to be all things to all men and women and children as well. This will give him a great many varied contacts. None is likely to be very deep or effective. His energies will be overtaxed, his efforts dissipated, and most of his work will fall to the level of mediocrity. However superior his talents, they are sure to be overtaxed if he tries to lead in all these activities. Furthermore, he may be supplanting valuable voluntary leadership which ought to be pushed forward and developed rather than eclipsed.

Finally, he may work toward a simpler, more unified type of organization and program, such that each phase of it may feel the inspiration of his leadership and the guidance of his supervision, and yet much of the actual work will be carried by responsible voluntary helpers. This whole program may be "church centered," leaving out no essential phase of Christian living, and yet identifying none with anything else than the church. Such a vision of the church as a school in Christian living awaits us.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Stock, Harry T., *Church Work With Young People*, Boston: The Pilgrim Press, Chapters XI, XII.

CHAPTER III

HOW CAN THE MINISTER HOLD HIS YOUNG PEOPLE?

Does the church really want its youth? Does the average adult church member or church officer care whether the church wins and holds the allegiance of a number of young people proportionate to the total church membership? There is little doubt about the verbal answer to such a question. The adult churchman would not only declare emphatically that the church wants the allegiance and participation of youth in good numbers, but he is very likely to feel that there is something radically wrong (with youth) if young people are conspicuously absent from church services. It will often be felt that the minister is at fault, because he is unable to draw and hold the young people.

As a matter of fact, the average church has its total program so organized, its minister's functions and relationships so defined, and its youth so related to its program, as to make it next to impossible for the minister to do what he should be expected to do for and with youth. Under the usual circumstances any minister who maintains effective contact with the youth of his church does it in spite of heavy handicaps, by sheer force of personality.

Youth, so far as activity, responsibility, and adapted program are concerned, is almost exclusively identified with the auxiliary organizations of the church. Naturally, the majority of young people feel much more allegiance and responsibility to these agencies than to the church proper. Their leadership is drawn from the laity. Frequently this leadership is so engrossed in the special activities of these organizations that little time and energy are left for the church proper. It is not at all unusual for Sunday church-school teachers to be very irregular in attendance at the regular church services. Youth becomes identified, therefore, with a program, and sometimes even a leadership, which tends to suggest anything but regular church attendance.

The minister, on the other hand, is largely identified with the church proper. If he has contact with these affiliated agencies where youth is reached, it is likely to be for the purpose of teaching an adult class. In any event it is looked upon as quite apart from his regular pastoral duties. In this situation scarcely anything has been left undone to drive a wedge, and even to erect a wall, between the minister and his youthful membership. He is identified with one organization and program and they with another. Between the two there tends to become "a great gulf fixed" unless conscious means are used to prevent it. In the light of this situation he is a remarkable minister indeed who can "hold the young people."

To widen the potential breach still further the minister usually works with an adult board of officers which is very likely to be subject to an amazing degree of inertia. In fact, it seems to be the chief function of some official boards to prevent change and development in the church's program.

Young people, on the other hand, are identified with much more flexible types of organizations and with dynamic, unsatisfied, growing programs, in so far at least as they are soundly educational. It is not surprising that youth sometimes misunderstands the minister and his apparent conservatism due to the inertia of his adult leaders.

In five summer conference classes in a course on "Youth in the Church" the writer had one hundred and seventy-six young people enrolled. The average age was slightly under sixteen. Most of these young people were high-school students. They were, of course, selected groups chosen to go to conference because of present or potential leadership ability and responsibility. They were further selected for their interest in the church by the fact that they chose this course from among several.

The first question asked in each class was, "What responsibilities do we now carry in the total program of our local churches?" The results were tabulated on the blackboard and a summary of these tabulations is as follows:

Sunday church-school teachers	52
Sunday church-school class or department officers	95
General Sunday church-school officers	11
Young people's society officers and committee chairmen	109
Missionary organization officers	17
Officers in scout troops	10
Church pianists and choir officers	3
Church ushers	3
Church "junior deacons"	11
Church deacon	1
Total	312

It is very evident that the church has a large place in her total program for youth to participate in carrying responsibility. Of these 312 offices, 294 are in auxiliaries of the church and only 18 in the church itself. Of course the situation will be readily justified by saying: "It is to be expected that youth would be identified with these auxiliaries rather than with the church itself, because these are the church's provision for its youth. It is here that youth gets its training and prepares for later responsibility in the church. Youth could hardly expect a place of responsibility in governing the church and planning its program, in distributing budgets, employing the minister, and determining policies. The work of the church is too important to be intrusted to inexperienced youth even in part."

Or the situation may be justified in another way by saying: "These agencies are all 'the church' in the broader sense. They are adapted programs of the church, and anyone who has a part in them has a part in the church. Young people should really feel flattered that the church plans so much of her program so as to give them a real place in it."

Theoretically, both these arguments sound plausible. The test of the first one is whether young people themselves so interpret the place given them. Do they understand that these agencies are training them for future church leadership? Does their identification for years with Sunday-school or young-people's-society responsibility tend to develop a loyalty to the church itself? Is there a natural point at which they "graduate" from apprenticeship in these preparatory organizations and assume similar responsibilities in the church itself? Are they satisfied with the situation as it is? Have these agencies delivered to the church proper an adequately trained young adulthood ready for the larger responsibilities of the church itself?

The test of the second argument is whether it actually squares with the facts. In the consciousness of the church membership at large and of young people themselves, is there any distinction between the "church" and the various organizations with which youth is so largely identified? When one has been to Sunday church school or to scout meeting, has he really been to church? Is the minister satisfied with such "church" attendance on the part of young people? Is adult church membership satisfied with it?

Let us hear the verdict of youth itself on these questions. Each of the students in the classes mentioned above wrote papers in class on the following topics: "Youth's Place in the Church as It Is and as It Ought to Be," "How I May Win a Place of Larger Usefulness in My Church," and "Changes Which I Should Like to See in the Total Program of My Church." Only sufficient discussion preceded the writing on each topic to make sure that its purpose was fully understood. Therefore the papers were not "loaded" by the leader's influence. They were unquestionably influenced by the factual tabulation on the blackboard of positions at present held by members of the group. Discussion was conducted *after* the papers had been written and the results tabulated on the blackboard as far as they lent themselves to such tabulation. There were not a sufficient number of students and the conditions were not sufficiently controlled to give these results any scientific value as a cross section of youth attitudes. They are, however, of considerably greater validity than a mere guess as to the attitudes of youth. Since students were not asked to sign the papers there is reason to believe that the responses were fairly frank.

The numbers at the left indicate the number of students who expressed substantially the opinion stated. There were, of course, wide variations in the exact statements and in the degree of positiveness with which the opinions were stated. Only those are reported here which were indicated by fifteen or more of the students. To make the tabulation more concrete papers are quoted after each item.

Twenty-three justify the present situation in which youth is identified largely with auxiliaries, since this is youth's proper place to train for leadership in the real church later.

"It seems as though the church is willing for us to work in the auxiliaries, but thinks we should wait until we are older and better prepared and wiser before we undertake the more serious responsibility of working in the church."

"In our church youth takes an active part in which might be termed the 'side issues,' that is, Sunday school, young people's society, and various other organizations or societies. It also helps out in the church choir and gives so much each month toward financial support of the church. I think this is enough for the youth of the church to participate in since something should be left for the older people, and that 'something' should be the most important of all the activities of the church."

Fifteen say that their own churches now give youth a sufficient place of responsibility and recognition. (Note that there were eighteen who held some responsibility in the church proper.)

"In my church the young people lead out in practically everything except running the 'church proper.' There are three very young men on the board. The minister is very young. The Sunday-school superintendent is very young. Three or four deacons are very young. This is a good situation, I think. The older men are there, always ready to help when needed, but really leaving most of the leadership to the young people."

Eighteen say that the situation with regard to youth's place in the church is improving.

"Personally I think that in my church youth is not given the place it should be; however, in the last five years they have been given more privileges. I do not think it is altogether the church's fault though. Recently the preacher resigned, one reason being that some had thought it was his fault that young people did not attend church."

Ninety-seven hold that the church proper now gives an inadequate place of responsibility and participation to youth.

"We are allowed to work in the organizations and in the Sunday school, but we are barred from working in the church proper."

"In our church at home the youth does not have the place it should have. Of course we have C. E. and missionary societies, etc., for our young people, but still if the church would only let the young people do more and have a higher place of responsibility, it would increase their interest in church work and the church. If the young people were given a higher place, they would feel their responsibility and they would do their part, get other young people interested and, I dare say, the church would recognize the change, and that for the good."

"The church, though, makes the youth at home in its outside activities but not in the true church. The church should give the youth a hand in the work as they will enjoy working and carrying on the work. I love to work in my church, but the youth have very little share in the work."

Ninety-five expressed the belief that youth should have a real place in the church itself, and that this need is not met by identity with and responsibility in auxiliaries.

"The youth to-day has found its place in the church as workers and leaders in the Sunday school, young people's society, and other such allied interests. This type of work may prove interesting to the youth, but I am of the opinion that they would be more benefited by being given even slight positions of leadership in the church itself. This would establish their interest and insure their continued attendance. Usually, youth thinks of the church as an adult institution. Hence their lack of interest."

"As it is now, the young people of our church are very interested in Sunday school and young people's society, Boy Scouting, and Triangle clubs, and activities of that kind. But they are not interested—that is, greatly interested—in the *church itself* and its activities. The reason, I believe, is that the young people are not given anything to do for the church—no responsibility is placed on them, and they fail to become interested. In young people's society they are given something to do, and they feel that they are really part of it, and hence are interested. If youth could be given a place of trust and responsibility in the church, it would be more interested in the church itself—that is what we need and want."

"The churches of to-day, guided by men of wisdom and understanding, recognize that the youth of to-day will make up the body of the church folk for to-morrow. Realizing this, they have provided places of training—in the Bible school, young people's society, missionary societies, scouting, and the like. Yet they have seemingly failed to bring them directly into the life of the church. They have neglected giving them duties which would transfer and hold their loyalty to the church. Young people should be given distinct and real duties and places in the church—in choir work, in ushering, as deacons and deaconesses, and in making calls."

Forty-eight maintain that training for church leadership cannot be done adequately and satisfactorily in auxiliaries alone. The church in its own program and organization should provide for apprenticeship.

"The youth in my church do not lead in any service whatever. The elder members of the church hold all church offices; therefore the young people do not have a very good chance to learn church work by watching the others. I believe the young people should be elected officers by the church and for the elder members to back them up in case of mistakes. Youth must learn from doing more than by seeing. They must train for church work."

Twenty-two say that if a larger place were given youth in the program and organization of the church proper, it would help to heal the breach between youth and the adulthood of the church.

"Our elders have their mind set, and it stays. They think that just because they are older they know everything. Maybe they do, but I think that they should devote a little time at least to the ideas of the young people to-day. Maybe they will be right in the end, but I think they will get something from our ideas, as well as us getting something from theirs. Don't you think so too?"

"While the older people should have some of the harder jobs in the church, they should give the young folks the jobs that they can do to train them for greater responsibility. A partnership should be formed and, with the wisdom of the elders and the pep and spirit of youth, great things can and will be done."

Thirty-two suggest that a larger place for youth in the church proper would help heal the breach between the church and its auxiliaries.

"As it stands at the present time there is a wide gap between the Sunday school and the church. The young people are brought up to take their places in the Sunday school, but are not given a chance to participate in church activities. Offices in the two organizations are so different youth does not care to continue out into the church."

Twenty-six feel that adults dominate the church too much.

"The youth seems to be crowded out of the church proper of to-day. There is no place for them because the adult fills the places."

"Very few church offices are held by young people, and in the majority of churches no places at all are held by the young people. I think one reason for this is the fact that the adults do not have enough confidence in the young people and are afraid of the new ideas and modern methods that they might use. An attitude like this will never encourage young people to take part in the church."

"Youth to-day is not very often recognized by the older folks who constitute the church. They seem to forget that youth too belongs to the temple of Christ. They think that youth is doing very well in duties in the Young People's Society, Sunday school, Triangle, etc., but that youth has no place in the church."

"Youth really have no important part in the church. Their work is in the Sunday school, young people's society, etc. Youth should have a part in the church work; they should work with the older people and at least have a chance to work in the church. The older people of the church do not think that the young people are responsible enough to hold offices in the church, but how do they know? They have not given us a chance."

"The church proper is mainly an older person's organization, the young members merely being passive objects, although members. The young people are not represented in the ruling of the church in any way, their only part in the program being listeners. To my mind, an ideal church would have an equal representation of young and older departments on the board, and the young folks to have an active part in the services."

Churches vary widely in their attitudes toward youth and the place given youth in their programs. No generalizations can be of universal application. The churches from which these conference students came quite obviously represented an attitude toward youth considerably above the average. Otherwise they would not have sent delegates to these conferences, paying, in many cases, a part of the expense. If the majority of young people from such churches as these are sensitive to an inadequate place in the church's consciousness, certainly the situation throughout the churches is little short of alarming.

These young people were able to think straight also. Their responses on the topic, "How Can I Win a Place of Greater Usefulness in My Church?" indicate this. Those made with greatest frequency are tabulated below with illustrative quotations from the papers.

One hundred and two said the best way is to earn a larger place by being faithful, dependable, and efficient in the less important tasks.

"To win a place of greater usefulness in my church I must work hard in the places which I now hold. If responsibility is turned upon me, I must bear it and that will train me for a better place to serve the church. The church is the same as big business in the respect that the man who is true, works hard, and always gives his best, is recognized."

"The only way to do anything is to start at the bottom and work up. If you have nothing to do, start in showing interest and showing that you want to do something. Show the elders and deacons that you want to do something. If there is a Junior

Board, try to get on it. If there is not, go to the pastor and tell him that you want something to do."

"I could not only do all I was asked but lots more. Show that I wanted to work and that I was able. Work hard and not be bashful, but not be conceited."

"I should not demand a position, but I should earn it. I wouldn't ask for a place in the church till I asked myself this question: 'Am I capable in body, mind, and being of holding such a position that is helping to enlarge Christ's kingdom.' "

Eighty suggested the need to prepare for the larger responsibilities by taking training courses, attending conferences, and studying more diligently.

"I think, first, that we should try to educate ourselves to fill better positions; second, we should serve as apprentices under some adult person; and third, be present at all meetings, which helps a lot."

"Study always helps. There are schools where one may be trained to do greater things. In this nothing is free. If it were, there would be no use living. Life would be so easy. There would be no sacrifice, no work to achieve a goal. By sacrifice and good hard work I may win a place of greater usefulness in my church."

Forty-one confess that if they would take part more willingly when asked, and even volunteer their services more cheerfully, greater opportunities would be discovered.

"To win a more favorable place in my church I can do the small things that I can see to be done now or that I am asked to do. I can always be ready and willing to do a thing when asked."

Thirty-seven believe that more regular and punctual attendance at meetings would be an important factor.

"I think the first course to take is to attend Sunday school and church regularly every Sunday."

Thirty-eight say that a spirit of greater co-operation and appreciation with less criticism would help to put them on better terms with the older leaders.

"I can co-operate with the leaders and do what I am called upon to do."

"We are sometimes too critical. We must try to change our ideas to fit in with the older ideas a little more smoothly. Then, after we have won the confidence of the older people pull them our way for a while."

Twenty propose to live a more earnest and consistent Christian life as a means to larger service.

"I could build my character so that it would be cleaner and stronger. I could live a life more like Jesus and I could try to become a better person for and through fellowship."

"Give of my best to my Master and try to live closer to Christ."

One poor lad found the path to church leadership somewhat complicated. "I must either become married to become a deacon or elder as the Bible is taken literally, or become a better singer in the choir to hold a permanent place in the church proper."

In discussing the topic "Changes Which I should Like to See in the Total Program of My Church," it was significant where these young people place the emphasis. The most commonly expressed desire was for a more reverent and dignified program of worship, using a better type of materials and having more careful preparation.

Next in emphasis was the activity side of the church's program. In service, recreation, and social life or fellowship many of these young people found the program of their churches lacking. A number believed that the total program should be more carefully unified. The desire that programs begin on time and close on time was frequently expressed.

This series of papers contained some rather bitter arraignments of the church's attitude toward youth. As interpreted by youth this is rather serious For example: "Under the present program of our church, the young people are indeed having a hard time. In spite of the fact that the young people's society and Sunday school have to meet in a rather dark, hot room, we have a fairly large attendance. We have asked to meet in the main auditorium but were refused this. What I would like to see would be the church get behind the young people and help them."

While this paper in no sense called for an evaluation of the pastor and other leadership, some of these young people found it impossible to suggest changes except in terms of more sympathetic leadership. The pastors of the four young people from whose papers the following quotations are taken would likely be amazed and dismayed if they knew the attitude which they had called out from their youth.

"Our pastor is not interested in young people. It makes no difference whether we are in the services or not."

"It seems that there are many ways in which my church can improve, and one is that the preacher should take more interest in young people and their services and make the people feel more in the worship spirit than in the 'one-sermon-a-day' spirit. The preacher in my church makes us feel that we are just minor objects in the church. He does not preach to the young people enough."

"Our church is in need of a leader who is interested in young people. When we want anything done, we must do it all by ourselves."

"The preacher does not seem to co-operate with the other departments. He has built up about him, through the church and prayer meeting, a circle of friends that do as he says, leaving out a program for youth. This makes our Sunday school almost a separate organization from the church."

There are, fortunately, in these papers some statements of warm appreciation of pastors. It is rather alarming, however, that the minister was mentioned rather infrequently, and when he was mentioned it was more frequently to blame than to praise—this in spite of the fact that care was taken in the classes to discourage criticism of the minister and to develop appreciation for him. It is, however, an embarrassing and humiliating experience for one minister to try to defend and exonerate his fellow ministers before a group of the church's choicest youth who are unquestionably harsh in their judgments.

The point here is neither that youth is wrong in judgment nor that ministers are for the most part blameworthy. The present alignment of youth with auxiliaries and of the minister with adults and the church proper, has made it impossible for the minister to win that place in the appreciations and loyalties of youth which he deserves. Here and there, either by changing the alignments or by a most fortunate strength of personality, the minister holds the place with youth which he should hold, both for his sake and theirs. The typical organizational and program alignment, however, works squarely against him.

Of course no valid generalizations can be drawn from such a limited number of young people, but a general summary is at least food for thought. It will stimulate any minister to inquire into the situation in his own church.

The present typical church program or "set-up" identifies youth with the church's auxiliaries rather than with the church itself. This provides valuable training for youth, but is not conducive to church loyalty. Leadership of auxiliaries is learned, but leadership in the church proper is not learned as well as it would be in positions of apprenticeship in the "real church." The "experience of churchmanship" is lacking. The situation tends to widen the gulf between youth and older church people, between the church and its auxiliaries, and to alienate the minister and youth.

Youth is generally eager for a place of greater usefulness and responsibility in the church and frankly admits that it will be won only by faithfulness, dependability, and training in subordinate positions. Youth feels, however, that this apprenticeship should relate him to the church proper as well as to its auxiliaries. Youth is highly appreciative of worship and is sensitive to poorly prepared and conducted services of worship in the church.

The present typical church program needs reconstruction to give youth a place of self-respect, of influence, and of real participation in the life of the church itself and not merely in auxiliary organizations. Such provision needs to be made for fellowship between young people and their elders, and for their participation on a basis of mutual respect and good will in common enterprises, as will heal the disastrous breach which so often divides them. Similarly, the breach between the church and auxiliaries will be healed and a unified program be made possible when the two are no longer identified respectively with two groups—adults and youth. Worship needs to be given a relatively larger emphasis and youth needs to be actively identified more closely with those aspects of the program carried by the minister. The church will have no basis for complaint against youth because of lack of loyalty and poise once she convinces youth he really "belongs" to her central program. The minister will naturally and readily win the allegiance of youth once they are brought into continuous fellowship by participation in a common program and organization. Above all, youth wants to be respected and taken seriously rather than patronized.

That the organization and program of the church can be so arranged as to bring the pastor into congenial and effective relations with his young people has been proven in the experience of many pastors who have dared to make the attempt.

The story of a unique type of Sunday-evening program which brought a new spirit and interest into his church is told in a jocular vein in *The Presbyterian Banner* (January 30, 1930) by the Rev. W. M. MacKay, pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Ishpeming, Michigan.

In the fall of 1929, says Mr. MacKay, we were confronted with two rather serious problems, lack of sufficient leadership for our young people's societies, and a waning evening congregation. As to the latter, a year ago the evening services were simply agony. Now they are, to borrow a "flaming-youth" expression, "a wow." Whence the change, and what has happened? No miracle, I assure you. We have simply given the young people plenty to do.

Pondering his twofold problem, the pastor one day decided to take that proverbial animal by the horns. Of course he talked the matter of the evening service over with the members of the session and asked their advice. It was suggested to try changing to a five-o'clock vesper hour, but, on canvassing the situation, it was found that that would not work. One "old-timer" even threatened a "boycott." It was then that the pastor had an inspiration, via his wife, to put the young people to work. It was thereupon announced from the pulpit Sunday morning that, beginning with the first Sunday in October, the evening service would be under the auspices of the young people. The adults were asked to attend and lend their moral support to the undertaking. At the first service there were just five adults present, and two of these were visitors. Even the leaders of the young people's societies were not enthusiastic. They felt that they were being let out of a job.

Well, that first service turned the trick. One of the leaders of the young people's societies waited for the pastor in the vestibule and said: "I have a confession to make. I felt peeved; felt I was being 'let out.' Even thought of joining the Episcopal choir, but I see I shall have plenty to do, and these young people are going to get something in these services."

As to the adults, one lady said, as matters progressed: "I simply can't stay away Sunday evenings; the services are so interesting."

The young people have organized, with the help of their leader, a junior vested choir. One young man leads the service each evening, while four others usher and take up the offering. The first Sunday evening in each month luncheon is served in the church parlors. This feature is being cared for by the senior girls. In our church bulletin the evening worship gets a prominent place with prayer and response printed in full. The service is dignified and worshipful.

Recently this amusing thing happened: One of the intermediate boys who appeared at luncheon wearing a sweater, when he found that he could not usher and take up the offering in that undignified garb, ran home and got his coat, and returned all slicked up.

It is probably premature to make any forecast of results, but we believe we have solved the evening-service problem in our church. As compared with last year the attendance at the evening hour has increased from a few faithful adults to a church filled to the door with both adults and young people. On the evening of October 27 Family Day was observed. The young folks were asked to bring their parents and sit with them as in old "family-pew" days. They did, and the church was packed with young and old. Special features of a similar kind were planned for some time ahead, including Armistice Sunday and National Loyalty Sunday. The young people also plan to put on a religious pantomime or play once a month.

Is the preacher happy in his work? He has been given a new lease of life. Is he getting chesty? Not a bit. He believes with the psalmist, "This is the Lord's doing. It is marvelous in our eyes." He would not rob God of the glory.

The experience of another pastor[1] with a reconstructed Sunday-evening program in a small suburban church is equally significant. For years the Sunday-evening service had been attended by from a third to half of the young people who attended the young people's society meeting the preceding hour, and by a handful of adults who attended from a sense of duty. The effect of the considerable number of young people leaving the church just at the evening hour of worship, and of such a few adults attending was bad on the few loyal young people who continued regularly to support this service.

An evening church school was launched in no way duplicating or detracting from the morning church school. The whole group gathered in the church worship room at seven o'clock to participate in a program of thirty minutes which was conducted by some one of the discussion groups or "societies." Then those present divided into graded discussion groups, each following a curriculum worked out by its own committees in conference with the pastor.

The original plan was to give the thirty-minute program largely to worship, but the groups became interested in using it for visiting speakers to present material bearing on their several discussion interests, so it became quite varied. Within two months, for example, this period provided the following features: A woman who had toured the Holy Land told of her experiences. A "Hi-Y" secretary gave a very stimulating talk on race relations based on his own experiences both in this country and in

---

[1] Rev. William F. Saye, Webster Groves, Missouri.

China. A religious education editor who had made a trip to Europe in quest of new pictures for use in church-school courses gave a talk on the sacred art in European galleries. Four young people gave well-prepared reviews of a series of articles on the menace of the modern motion pictures, by Fred Eastman, in The Christian Century. A motion picture showing young people's summer conferences was exhibited. A program of music and talks was given by two Filipino students. A welfare worker and a native factory worker from Marion, North Carolina, who were participants in the labor troubles there, told the story and gave from observation much of the background of the troubles.

In every case one of the youth groups had made the arrangements for these features and in most cases the feature was part of their discussion program. Here were race relationships, the Holy Land, sacred art, labor troubles, the motion-picture menace, and training for Christian leadership, all dealt with in this general meeting within two months, and presented in a first-hand. realistic manner.

The plan started out with four discussion groups or societies all in the adolescent range. It soon became necessary, however, to add a junior group and an adult group to take care of a considerable number of both who persisted in attending. The pastor in all this was counselor, guide, organizer, and inspirer. His Sunday evening sermon was gone, but in its place were many vital contacts with the activities and experiences of youth.

A distinctively fruitful program in the young people's field is being carried out in Tulip Street

Methodist Church, Nashville, Tennessee. The pastor, Rev. B. B. Pennington, explains it as follows:

We have been successful in holding our young people through an efficient educational program, that is, trained teachers and prepared worship programs, etc. The Sunday evening fellowship meetings have also been successful. Attendance at church has been in a measure successful. This is due to my contact with youth. I attend their meetings, keep in touch with them as pastor, and try to bring them a message that is real because it fits into their experiences of to-day. For example, these themes: "Winking Lights on Danger Curves"; "Voices from the Unseen"; "The Traffic Jam"; "Christmas Lighted Streets"; "Playing the Game"; "Wayside Wells"; "Speedometer or Compass," etc. We do not stress the social pleasures much, though we have a social occasionally.

The Rev. Walter H. Riley, minister of The Federated Church (Congregational-Presbyterian), Columbus, Nebraska, explains a very successful program with students of the high-school age. After stating that the pastor is also considered the director of religious education, Mr. Riley describes the program for high-school students as follows:

A well-developed, dignified, and worthy program is provided in the high-school department, to which the boys and girls respond wonderfully well. That is to a considerable extent due to the superintendent of the department, who is eminently qualified for that particular task. Incidentally, we give her no other major task in the church's program, so that her energy can be used for this most important part of our educational task.

Some of the activities of the department are:

a. A dignified and worthy program of worship, into which nearly all enter heartily and with genuine reverence. They came from a lower department where the same high standard prevails in the worship service, so that it is not new or strange to them.

b. Two or three times a year a communion service is held for this department alone—teachers and pupils. The pastor has charge, two of the most reliable boys officiate as "deacons." The pastor gives an explanatory talk on some phase of the communion service, and all is done with perfect reverence and dignity. (Ours being an exceedingly "free" church, no barriers are raised, and all the young people, without exception, participate readily, no matter whether they have yet been received into full church membership or not.) The pastor considers this "senior communion service" among the most notable of his church activities.

c. This department of the church school is also an integral part of the church; it is not only so regarded by both church and young people, but it is in reality such. The church supports the church school—all other departments as well as this—from the regular church budget; and the young people contribute to both the local and benevolence budgets of the church. In both lines of giving their offerings go to direct projects, but the local budget offerings always being designated as applying to the salary of the church's director of music, a popular music teacher of the community who also occasionally sings a solo in the worship service of the young people's department.

d. At the beginning of each Lenten season the pastor has the entire department at the class-hour period, to consider freely and fairly informally the matters usually taken up in a "pastor's class." In fact, the department is the "pastor's class," the program varying from year to year. In addition to this, the pastor has at times some part in the worship service, always upon invitation of the person in charge.

The Young People's Society is as follows:

a. This has no "membership list," but is made up of all the boys and girls of the high-school department of the church school. It is, by both leaders and youth, regarded as a phase of the department's activities.

b. There is absolutely no duplication of activities and efforts. The "Young People's Society" has its own officers, is organized to give free expression to the wishes of the young people themselves. It has no budget, that part of its work being taken care of by the department. Its meetings are held Sunday evenings, and social gatherings when it wishes—most of the social affairs of the department are arranged and managed through the more informal "Young People's Society."

c. The pastor has constant and intimate connection with the young people, both in their Sunday-evening meetings and in their social affairs, and is welcome at all of them. The young people themselves seem never to think that it might be otherwise, and he is expected to be present and to participate in their activities as a matter of course.

There are certain items on which we place special emphasis:

a. Each year for nine years a delegation of young people has gone to a summer conference, seventy-five miles away, directed by a man whom they all love and admire. The pastor has for these nine years been intimately associated with the conference as a member of its faculty, with special emphasis on Bible study. The net result of these summer conferences, even upon those who do not attend, cannot be calculated.

b. For some years a series of "week-end conferences" in our own and neighboring churches, in which the young people participate freely, both in making and carrying out the program as well as in personal attendance. These too are of great influence in deepening and perpetuating their interest in the church and its program.

c. We have on occasion made a good deal of dramatics for the young people, especially for Sunday-evening services in the church. That is much interfered with by the schedule of activities in the local high school, but is a valuable line of activity when it can be well carried out.

d. With somewhat extended intervals between, the young people prepare and conduct entire church services. One of the most impressive morning church services we have ever had was thus conducted by a group of twenty-seven high-school boys and girls, with four speakers, violin music, choir, various readers, etc. It was good for the young people, but better for the church.

The Rev. E. Merle Adams explains a fruitful young people's program in First Congregational Church, Norfolk, Nebraska, in two ways. First, through a young people's organization known as "The Scrooby Club," which is quite indigenous and local in its nature. Second, through the use of the project principle in all the young people's work. Such enterprises are undertaken as a week-end young people's conference; pre-Easter vesper services sponsored by the young people; "Young People's Week" in the church calendar; occasional responsibility for the morning church service; getting out a weekly bulletin; calling on sick; conducting mid-week meetings; responsibility for the program celebrating the sixtieth anniversary of the church; and sending good delegations to young people's summer conferences.

Here the pastor has taken a very definite and influential part in guiding and inspiring the development of a rich program of educational activities. He has carefully preserved local autonomy and stimulated initiative and originality by keeping the organization flexible and indigenous. He has created interest and stimulated personality-forming activities by placing much responsibility on youth.

Stanley U. North, minister of Briarcliff Congregational Church, Briarcliff Manor, New York, explains a fruitful young people's program as not due to any secret formula, but, rather, to "quite commonplace methods."

Large delegations to young people's summer conferences, commissioned at a morning church service on their departure and reporting to a similar service on their return, have brought to the whole church and its young people in particular inspiration, insight, and growth not otherwise possible. Fellowship with other youth groups in conference and in joint meetings growing out of conference contacts has been enriching and stimulating.

The young people's society meetings featuring informal discussion circles, first-hand interracial contacts, and devotional elements which carry through the year many of the summer conference associations form a vital factor in the religious life and church experience of these young people.

The pastor supplies the basic leadership in all this, carefully and consciously cultivating the friendship of his young people. He goes with them to summer conference and shares in all their church life. This pastor quite frankly admits his own responsibility in seeing to it that the youth program of his church is vital and worth while.

There has been no magic in the methods used by these pastors. Sensing the problems and needs arising out of the traditional situation so clearly pointed out by the young people themselves in the papers quoted, these men have adopted various common-sense solutions. The pastor has accepted definite educational responsibility. He has set out to work with young people rather than for them. He has eliminated the artificial and divisive distinctions between "church" and those agencies in which young people find most of their religious activities and guidance. He has placed large responsibility on youth and has depended primarily on religious activity rather than listening to sermons and lectures as the means by which youthful Christian personality grows. There is probably an educational solution to the youth problem in every church and community if the pastor is educationally minded enough to find it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Betts and Hawthorne, *Method in Teaching Religion*, The Abingdon Press, Chapter XII.
McKibben, Frank M., *Intermediate Method in the Church School*, The Abingdon Press, Chapters I, VI, and VII.
Meredith, William V., *Pageantry and Dramatics in Religious Education*, The Abingdon Press, Chapter XII.
Moore, Anne M., *Senior Method in the Church School*, The Abingdon Press, Chapters XIV and XVI.
Munro, Harry C., *Agencies for the Religious Education of Adolescents*, Saint Louis, Bethany Press.
Richardson, Norman E., *The Church at Play*, The Abingdon Press, Chapters I and XIII.
Stock, Harry T., *Church Work With Young People*, Boston: The Pilgrim Press, Chapters XI, XII.

CHAPTER IV

IS THE JUNIOR CHURCH A WAY OUT?

The typical church program makes about three times the provision to meet the religious needs of adults that it makes for children. The Sunday church-school session is about an hour and a quarter in length. It provides equally well for adults and for children. Not infrexuently the most capable and well-trained teachers are kept in the adult classes. The minister himself more frequently serves as a leader of adults than of children. The Sunday church school makes at least as vigorous an attempt to serve one group as the other.

The "preaching service" lasts about an hour and a quarter. While children are welcome in it, their needs are seldom considered and their presence is not assumed in planning the program. In some cases a brief children's sermon recognizes their presence. Its manner and place in the program emphasize rather than deny the fact that the service is calculated to reach adults primarily, and is built around their needs and interests. Probably enough of the Sunday church-school program of children is better adapted to adults to offset any special provision made for children in the regular church service.

Another program in the evening in most churches makes additional provision of an hour or more for adult needs and interests. In some churches regular midweek prayer meetings add still further to the adult program. From the standpoint of program time alone, adults have three times the chance to learn Christian living through the church that children have.

Not only so, but the largest investments are made in the adult program. Cost for professional leadership for music and preaching far exceeds specific investments for corresponding values in the children's programs, except rarely where a professional children's worker is employed. If the junior church or any other agency will help to correct this disproportionate provision for the needs of the respective groups, there ought to be little question about the propriety and need of it.

The failure of the ordinary Sunday church-school program to develop church loyalty and a sense of interest in and identification with the church itself, apparently calls for a remedy. If the junior church will bridge this gap and induct childhood and youth gradually and naturally into the church proper, surely it performs an indispensable service.

There is an increasing recognition of the reality and vital necessity of the worship experience in the lives of children as well as of adults. In fact, the fullest development of the worship life of the individual seems to require that it begins in the earliest years and grow and deepen with the enrichment of broadening experience. The worship needs of children, therefore, are as much the responsibility of the church as are those of adults. Since they cannot be adequately cared for in a program centering in adult experience, obviously some other equally careful provision must be made for them. The junior church provides for this need.

The family pew, whether or not it ever existed outside the fertile memories of those who long for "the good old days," certainly does not exist in many churches to-day. When children do sit with their parents, it is likely to be to the annoyance of those in surrounding seats. The ideal rather fades out in the presence of the reality. For all concerned it is natural to conclude that some interesting program should be provided to take care of the children quietly and harmlessly while parents worship. The junior church performs this useful function.

Some churches have directors of religious education whose regular Sunday duties are over ordinarily when Sunday church school closes. It will make a further use of their time and talents to do on a small scale, for the children, what the minister is doing for the adults. Some directors did not miss the pulpit by very far and have strong inclinations to preach. On the whole, it is far more satisfactory for these sermonic urges to express themselves upon the children of the congregation than to seek a more formal hearing. Another excellent reason for the junior church.

But what is the junior church? For full details by two of its advocates see Homer J. Councilor, *The Junior Church* (The Century Co.), and Weldon F. Crossland, *The Junior Church in Action* (Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc.).[1] It is an organization of boys and girls ranging from eight or nine to fifteen or sixteen years of age, patterned after the regular church. The officers bear the same names and are chosen in a similar manner. As far as practicable the regular functions and procedures are carried out as by them. The order of service is held simultaneously with the adult church service in a separate room and is modeled after it as far as necessary adaptations to children allow. The sermonette, choir, offering, and other features make it as much like real church as possible.

---

[1] A treatment on sounder educational principles which more nearly approaches an extended session of the Sunday church school is given by O. Sherwood Gates, *The Junior Church Year Book*, Cokesbury Press.

In order to make it a model church organization there must be, of course, a regularly constituted membership. A clear distinction between regular church membership and membership in the junior church is advocated in spite of the seeming confusion involved. In fact, membership in the junior church is more nearly parallel with membership in the Sunday church school than in the real church. It is the aim of the organization, however, to give boys and girls practice in the activities of church life so that when they get into the real church they will already be skilled for its leadership.

Obviously, the junior church aims to meet some very definite needs. It provides more time conveniently fitting into the Sunday schedule, gives wholesome emphasis to worship, acquaints boys and girls with church organization, and aims to develop church loyalty.

The whole junior church idea, however, is based upon a series of false assumptions without which no case could be made for it. It assumes that the Sunday church school is purely an instruction and Bible drill agency unable to teach children how to worship and provide them with opportunity for the experience of worship. It ignores the whole trend of modern church-school practice which places the worship experience at the very center of the curriculum. The only way to create a need for the junior church at this point would be to keep the church school two or three decades behind the times. If it is in that belated condition, perhaps some reconstruction of the church-school program is far more needed than a new organization.

A second false assumption is that a richer, more vital worship experience can be provided in an ungraded group ranging through the ages of three or four church-school departments than in the more carefully classified groups of the church school.

A third false assumption is that the worship of children is improved by separating it distinctly from the learning activities of the church school. The whole present trend, backed by sound psychology and careful experimentation, is toward a close integration of the worship elements with other elements in the educational program.

The junior church assumes that the religious needs of children can be met by "sermonettes." No assumption has been more disastrously exploded by educational psychology as well as by religious experience. Research and experimentation have led religious educators to center method in purposeful activity on the part of pupils rather than in listening to instruction, admonition, or exhortation. The value of the usual children's sermon has already been discussed in Chapter II.

It is an unfounded assumption that the name "junior church" tends to beget loyalty to the real church more than does the term church school.

It is falsely assumed that because the junior church is formally patterned after the real church, experience in the one organization will beget loyalty to the other. As well assume that patterning the kindergarten after a college lecture course would beget an ardent college spirit in five-year-olds. The surest way to lure youth on from one educational level to the next is to pattern the method and organization of each grade on the characteristics and experiences of that age-group. An imitation university will do less to prepare ten-year-olds for real college than will a first-class fifth grade.

The junior church has the most difficulty in justifying itself in its relation to the Sunday church school. If its curriculum of music, ritual, and sermonettes is unrelated to the curriculum of the church school, it fails to provide the desirable unified and cumulative experience which children need, but, rather, provides them two unrelated, confusing, perhaps even conflicting units. The crying need is for closer co-ordination of aims and materials so as to re-enforce rather than to be confusing or neutralizing in effect.

If an attempt be made to co-ordinate the two programs, two difficulties arise. The change in leadership makes this cumbersome to manage; and the wider age range means that two or more church-school departments are involved, making co-ordination with the several programs necessary. Of course, any real correlation is impossible. Furthermore, danger of overlapping, duplication, and even competition is likely.

The elements in the "junior church" which duplicate the real church might far better be provided by participation in the real church than by an imitation program. Junior communion services, choir processionals, and liturgies would grace the regular church service and should be a part of it rather than set apart from it.

The elements in the junior church which duplicate the Sunday church-school session should be provided there more adequately by possibly expanding the time available for them. This will give them greater value than to carry them under a different leadership and organizational name.

In so far as the method used in junior church follows that used in the church school it is a duplication. In so far as it differs it is of questionable educational merit. The loose grading or wide age range of the junior church almost prescribes inferior procedure.

There is nothing against which leaders of youth need more carefully to guard in religious matters than artificiality, unreality, or sham. To set up a make-believe church in imitation of the real church is to invite trouble at this vital point. How do we know that the "make-believe" spirit will be restricted to the formal organization and program? Whatever we have for youth, let's have it *real.* If they are not to be in the real church, let their organization be a Scout troop or a club or a class, only have it the real thing, not an imitation. The so-called junior church, the more beautifully it parallels the real church, the greater it menaces the child's sense of reality in religion.

Especially objectionable is the plan in some junior churches of having boys "preach" sermons. This involves abnormal overstimulation and self-consciousness and invites most unwholesome reactions. Children do not normally and naturally preach at one another. They can share their experiences quite wholesomely and naturally in ways of their own through conversation, discussion, worship, art, and play.

A comparison of any of the ordinary series of sermonettes for the junior church with a good piece of curriculum material in the junior or intermediate courses reveals the inferiority of the former in educational viewpoint, sound method, and grasp of pedagogical principles. The redeeming feature is that the leadership is often superior in personality in the junior church, but why handicap such leaders with antiquated and discarded educational procedure? They are the very persons whose whole approach to childhood should be on the soundest educational principles.

There is no question that one of the greatest religious needs of childhood and youth is what Doctor Soares[2] has called "the experience of churchmanship." We have already noted the failure of the church to provide adequately for youth in this respect. To identify youth with a group of auxiliaries which go under various names other than that of the church, and to identify the church with adult programs and interests is to preclude the likelihood that youth will develop a real church consciousness and a feeling that he "really belongs."

The same situation pertains as to children, if, indeed, it is not worse. There is little question in the minds of either adults or young people that the latter are really eligible for full church membership and participation if they are willing to avail themselves of the privilege. There is still a great deal of haziness as to just what relationship the child may have with the church itself. The advocates of the junior church who insist that membership in the junior church is something quite different from real church membership, complicate rather than simplify this problem.

---

[2] Soares, Theodore G., *Religious Education.* University of Chicago Press.

Of course it is our theological backgrounds which create our difficulties here and cause children real anxiety as to just where they have a right to stand. Membership in most churches is based upon an outworn theology which assumes that all persons are sharply divided into two categories, the "saved" and the "lost." The "saved" are those who have had a definite religious experience of conversion from a life of sin to a state of forgiven blessedness. Only those old enough to have sufficient self-consciousness and moral independence for such an experience are eligible for church membership. Children are nonentities so far as the church is concerned until they have reached the age at which this more or less cataclysmic experience may be expected. When they have reached that age, but have not yet had the experience they are "lost" and are objects of evangelistic effort.

The whole program of Christian religious education assumes for childhood a very different situation from that. Sharing with Jesus a bright rather than a dark picture of childhood, the teacher assumes that the child can become conscious of relationships with God almost as soon as he is conscious of relationships with other persons. The little child's experience of the heavenly Father is just as real as the experience of his parent or teacher. This does not mean that his conceptions are the same or that his understanding is either accurate or thorough. It does mean that God is a factor in his life for interpreting and enriching experience and that motives may be as genuinely religious in early years as at any time in life.

The teacher observes growth and increasing richness in the child's experience in so far as the aims of nurture are realized. There will be levels where little progress seems to be made. There will appear to be disappointing reversals. Again there will be sudden upward trends when progress is rapid. Learning to live the Christian life has its "plateaus of learning" of which educational psychology tells us, just as any other learning process. It is possible, however, for the whole general trend to be upward.

There will come a time normally when the child will say: "I belong to Christ and his church. His church is my church. Whatever people do to show that they belong to him and his church I want to do." The result will be a process or ceremony of "joining the church."

The child's problem is now clear. Has he been outside the church up to this point? He has known and talked to the heavenly Father for years. What difference has "joining the church" made? If it has made no difference in his real status, either the church doesn't amount to much or else joining it is meaningless. Not that any child reasons this all out. The child doesn't reason. He *feels*. And how he feels toward the church is a very vital matter both for himself and the church. Both our present haziness about the child's status in the church and the way in which our program is organized tend to endanger the desirable feeling attitudes of children toward the church. Positive suggestions for a remedy must await our later presentation of a somewhat new conception of the church itself.

The junior church does not solve or simplify this problem of the child's status in the church. To the extent that the child really conceives of the junior church as a church he now has two so-called churches —one which he can join just as he joins Sunday church school, the other not for him but for his elders. Why should joining the one make him more loyal to the other?

An "experience of churchmanship" is needed during the growing years of childhood, but no substitute for the real church will suffice. The essential element in the experience of churchmanship is the sense of belonging to and participating in the great fellowship of all Christians—the "communion of saints." The child who is denied this privilege but is provided a pseudo-church made up of others like himself not yet eligible for the larger fellowship, is as unfortunate in his church life as is the orphan doomed to an institution instead of a home. It is just the range of ages and the consideration of the strong for the weak and the wise for the simple, that make the home what it is rather than a mere institution of welfare.

There is real danger in recognizing any substitute for the full experience of churchmanship in the church itself. How this is to be provided is the problem of a later chapter. Let us not expect too cheap and easy a solution.

Not only does the junior church fail to provide an experience of identity with the church, but it works definitely against that experience in some ways. It provides a minister other than the minister of the church. Children know the difference. The one provided for them may be quite superior as a children's leader, but he is not *the* minister and cannot symbolize the church itself as the real minister does. Church loyalty and loyalty to the minister are not identical, but it is difficult for one to thrive without the other.

The worship experience is very susceptible to surroundings. The sanctuary used for general church worship tends to take on associations and atmosphere and almost personality. If childhood and youth are provided worship experiences exclusively in other rooms with different setting, the sanctuary itself will be largely lost on them as they make the transfer. The experience of churchmanship of even young children needs to include worship in the sanctuary of the congregation.

The worship experience centers largely in the feeling life. It is well known that there is far less difference among various age levels in the emotions than in the intellectual life. A situation calling for an intellectual response such as a scientific lecture, a problem in mathematics or a conundrum will be highly selective in a group of all ages. If adapted to ten-year-olds, it will bore the high-school student. If suited to later adolescents it will eliminate all younger. A situation, however, calling for an emotional response is much less selective. A cry of "Fire!" a pedestrian slipping on a banana peel or chasing his hat in the wind, a piece of really good music, or the thrill of a toboggan slide will arouse much the same response from a wide range of ages, since the response is chiefly emotional. Worship, therefore, requires less thorough grading than other aspects of the program because it centers so largely in the feeling life.

It is impossible and undesirable to dissociate worship from other types of learning and experience, so graded programs need to provide it. It is possible, however, if proper care has been taken in selection and adaptation of materials, for a worship experience to embrace a wide range of ages and be a rich bond of fellowship. The junior church fails to integrate worship with the larger program of the church school, and also fails to provide it in the wider fellowship of the whole church.

A sound alternative to the junior church is to be found by expanding and enriching the Sunday church-school program for the younger age groups, so as to parallel the sermon for adults, but yet arranged so as to provide a worship experience for the entire church family together. This does not eliminate graded worship nor the mastery of worship materials by age-group programs, but it does require that the general worship program take careful account of all ages and of materials which have been mastered and interpreted in department programs.

This requires that the minister and others who prepare and conduct the general worship program be in the closest touch with all department worship programs and the learning of worship materials. Instead of conducting a single worship program pitched to the needs of adults, the minister will supervise the entire worship experience and life of his congregation including all age groups. He will see to it that graded worship is available throughout the age range, but that this will culminate in a great common worship experience of the whole church family. This requires that most careful and skillful co-ordination of all worship provisions be made. It is impossible for the minister to turn over to others the worship supervision of childhood and youth and then to conduct his church worship with reference to their programs. This will disintegrate rather than unify.

The expanded church-school session may well culminate in a great congregational assembly for common worship, after the adults have had their discussion groups and sermon, and the children and youth have had their graded worship and rich curriculum of study and other learning activities. But this is only one aspect of the full reconstruction of the church's program which must be treated later.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Betts and Hawthorne, *Method in Teaching Religion*, The Abingdon Press, Chapter XVIII.

Fiske, G. Walter, *Purpose in Teaching Religion*, New York: The Abingdon Press, Chapter XIV.

Munro, Harry C., *The Church as a School*, Saint Louis, Bethany Press, Chapters III, IV.

Powell, Marie Cole, *Junior Method in the Church School*, The Abingdon Press, Chapters XI, XII, XIII, XVIII, XIX.

Soares, Theodore G., *Religious Education*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Chapters XIII, XIV.

Stock, Harry T., *Church Work With Young People*, Boston: The Pilgrim Press, Chapter VI.

CHAPTER V

WHAT IS THE CHURCH TRYING TO DO?

"It is very doubtful, to my mind, whether all the preaching that will be done in America during the next twelve months, let us say, will add as much to the well-being of America as the work of one honest, efficient farmer, or as that of a humble teacher in some little red schoolhouse."[1] This was the conclusion at which John Spargo arrived a decade ago through a study which resulted in an article in the Christian Century on "The Futility of Preaching." John Spargo's judgment is evidently open to question, for considerable preaching has persisted in spite of his wholesale and rather flippant disposition of it. There are millions who disagree with him sharply, every one of whom has availed himself of many more opportunities than has John Spargo to make the comparison.

However, criticism of this type challenges the church to justify its existence and the large investments of effort, talent, time, and funds which are made in its program and equipment. In a generation as utilitarian and iconoclastic as our own, no institution can hope to flourish without giving rather plain evidence that it is rendering certain specific service to human welfare commensurate with the cost of its upkeep.

The average church is inclined to take itself for granted without ever very seriously facing the question as to precisely what it exists for. There could scarcely be a more profitable exercise for the pastor and his board of officers than to face up frankly and fearlessly to this question. Of course there are many ready answers, given far too glibly and dogmatically to represent the results of any careful thinking. A question of this kind is almost inevitably faced by a process of rationalizing rather than by a process of creative thinking.

---

[1] The Christian Century, May 20, 1920. Quoted by permission.

We who are deeply interested in the church, its perpetuity and growth, can readily detect the arguments of those who do not care for the church as mere rationalization. We believe they do not care for the church because they are selfish or worldly, or want to escape its obligations or for some other such unlovely reason. But they really attempt to justify their indifference by finding fault with the church, with their own upbringing, or with the circumstances in which they have been placed. Having taken a position which, on close analysis, is not very tenable, they are quite ingenious in rationalizing until their position really seems to themselves impregnable.

Church members, on the other hand, find themselves lined up with the church, appreciative of its fellowship and sensitive to its obligations. But why keep the church going? Why continue under these obligations and seek to enlarge them by bringing others also to share in them? Immediately the church member (even the pastor, dare we say?) begins a process of rationalizing, no more reliable in its results than that of the person who refuses church responsibilities, even though its motives may be on a higher plane. What we need in one case as much as in the other is some good sound creative thinking in search of the real merits of the case. Just what *is* the church attempting to do which justifies her continued existence and support?

If we were to attempt a categorical answer to this question here, of course we might justly be charged not only with rationalizing, but with seeking to terminate rather than stimulate this desirable process of creative and critical thinking on the part of the reader. Each pastor in serious and extended conference with his church leaders should seek to answer this question in his own way and for his own church. And the answer should be regularly up for review and restatement as aims are approached, as new needs arise, and as insight becomes clearer through experience.

There are, however, a number of considerations to which attention may well be called in thinking the question through. There is an increasing and altogether wholesome tendency to try to discover on questions of this kind just what the position and purpose and example of Jesus were. Our escape quite generally from the bondage of a dead-level conception of the Bible has tended greatly to magnify the influence of Jesus himself upon our thinking. We care more to discover the actual living kernel of his message and purpose than we do to revere the shell which has preserved it and brought it down to us.

Jesus seldom, if ever, mentioned the church as an organized institution, although its development as the embodiment and perpetuator of the purpose which he released in the hearts of his companions seems to have been inevitable. He talked continually of the kingdom of God, an order of society in which all men should dwell together in love as children of a common Father.

Yet it was not so much a new order of society about which he talked and dreamed as it was a new order of men, a new type of person. He was marvelously restrained in dealing with such intrenched social abuses as slavery, militarism, political corruption, and economic exploitation, abhorrent as they must have been to him. He was quite clear, however, in depicting the type of person who would characterize the new order. Not only so, but in his own personal conduct, attitudes, and relationships he demonstrated such a personality. Furthermore, he did this not in the nature of a "demonstration," but, rather, as though his seemed the only sensible and reasonable way in which to live. Men marveled that he practiced his own maxim, "Love your enemies," and yet no one else has discovered a way to treat enemies so likely to prevent *real* injury from them. Human experience seems likely, in the long run, to validate his insight. Men were amazed at his complete trust in God, and yet he in turn "marveled at their lack of faith." He not only proposed a new type of personality, he tried it out and could not understand how others should be so dumb as to live otherwise.

Many a panacea has been sought for the ills of humanity in some new system of society. Socialism, or communism, or anarchy, or generous and widespread benevolence has been the dream of idealists for issuing in the millennium. But the solution proposed by Jesus was not so much a new system or a reconstructed economic order as it was a new spirit, both individually and socially. Jesus was not deceived by the naïve hope that life itself could be fundamentally improved by simply changing the conditions of living and the methods of making a living. Once we have caught the real essence of the new spirit, we might find existing social molds quite inadequate to contain and express it, just as the fermenting of new wine would put too heavy a strain upon old wine skins. But the new spirit will not lack for modes of expression once it has actually been achieved.

Again, Jesus seems to have been concerned not so much about new modes of living and new types of activity as he was about a new attitude toward living and new motives for activity. He called some from their vocations, to be sure, but his chief purpose was to make possible a larger and more continuous sharing of experience with them and they with him, so as to set them apart as special exemplars and protagonists of the new spirit and type of personality. His purpose in the lives of the majority with whom he dealt seems to have been to bring them to a new realization of their own inherent worth as persons, of God's evaluation of and interest in each of them, and of the consequent grounds for self-respect and appreciation of others. Thereby he sought to create new motive power for noble living and new social attitudes.

There is no possibility of conflict between the advocates of the "social gospel" and those of "personal religion" except as each comprehends but a partial view of Jesus' purpose and example. His purpose is to inaugurate a new order of society, but the essence of the new order is its spirit rather than its form. This new spirit can come only as persons achieve it and release its power in social living. His purpose is to create a new type of person, but the essential characteristic of the new person is not his particular vocation or activities or performances, but the spirit in which he goes about them and the motives prompting or driving him.

A native Christian shoemaker of India was asked one day how he could be so happy at such a humble occupation, and why he took such pains with his work. "Sir," he replied, "I make every pair of shoes as though they were for Jesus." The type of person whom Jesus sought to develop was the one who would do whatever he did, whether building a house, making a shoe, digging a ditch, or preaching a sermon, "as unto God." That, to Jesus, was simply the fine art of living wholly and abundantly. He had discovered and perfected it in his own experience and could not bear to see others deprive themselves of it.

We might summarize the purpose of Jesus upon this background by saying, "He tried to develop other persons sufficiently like himself that they would set about transforming society into the kingdom of God."

The method of Jesus in carrying out this purpose was consistently simple and direct. He was tempted to use other methods much more in accord with the temper of his day and rather definitely expected as the identifying signs of the Messiah. The appeal to self-interest, the appeal to the love of the spectacular, and the appeal to prestige and power even at the cost of compromise, were among the methods which might have been chosen, for all these elements are apparent in the dramatic presentation of these temptations given in the Gospels. Such short-cut methods to popularity and influence would have been powerful aids in starting a "movement" and in establishing institutional strength. They would, however, have led him away from his central purpose, deforming his own personality into the base and the ordinary.

If we look to the gospel records, rather than to theology, for the method by which Jesus came into possession of his own superlative personality, we discover why he had confidence that he could help others to become more like himself. His matchless character was in some measure, if not fully, an achievement rather than an endowment. This is shown in the experience of temptation which he described so dramatically that its colorful pictures formed a place in the permanent records about him. His dependence upon prayer, especially at times of crisis, shows the cost of his victories. "A whole night" spent in prayer can mean nothing short of a terrific struggle for mastery of the highest values over lower ones. The beasts as well as the angels were with him in the wilderness. The tiny window which Luke 2.52 opens for us upon his growth from childhood into manhood reveals symmetrical but natural achievement. There was nothing about the attitudes of his old neighbors or the members of his own family by which they placed him in a category by himself as exempt from the common lot of humanity. Having achieved in his own experience a personality which, if it could but be multiplied by similar experiences in the lives of enough others, would usher in the kingdom of God. he set about it to accomplish that very purpose.

His method was one of shared experience. Gathering about himself a group sufficiently small that he could have intimate and continuous fellowship with each, he set about their gradual transformation. He shared such of their experiences as were consistent with his own personality and purpose, in the hope that he might thereby get them to share his experience of God, the Father, and the envisioned Kingdom.

Jesus was a teacher. It was the title given him far more frequently than any other. He was not a schoolman, nor had he any professional standing. He won this title, in spite of his vocation as a carpenter and his reputation as an unlearned man, by the sheer excellence of his teaching ability. His power as a teacher and his mastery of teaching technique have never been questioned by any school of educational philosophy. To-day, with our interpretation of curriculum as the learner's experience and method as the enrichment and redirection of experience through sharing, we still find him the ideal teacher. In other words, the method by which he set out to accomplish his purpose, we now find to be education lifted to its highest level.

The purposes of Jesus and the remarkable dynamic of his personality came to be shared in a measure at least by his immediate disciples. In turn they became embodied in an institution—the early church. Paul's reference to the church as the body of Christ probably meant precisely that. The purposes and power which originally expressed themselves through one human body had now brought many such individuals in some measure to embody them. Organized into the church, these many embodiments of his purpose and power became a glorified body marvelously extended in its reach and capacity.

We have no source from which to learn what should be the purpose of the church as reliable as the purpose of Jesus himself. Stating his purpose in terms of the church, we have the following: It is the purpose of the church to develop persons sufficiently Christlike that they will set about transforming society into the kingdom of God.

Now, the development of a desired type of personality is a process subject to a large measure of control. Certain capacities and certain limitations are provided by heredity. This means, of course, that the same methods of controlling the developmental process will produce a variable result because of these inherent differences. Jesus, however, was exceedingly optimistic about the possibilities of even the most unpromising of those who came to him for help. Experimental psychology and education justify a large measure of optimism on scientific grounds. Certainly, the experience of Christian workers goes even further in substantiating Jesus' own belief in the inherent capacities for Christlikeness of even unpromising individuals. Such records as Harold Begbie's *Twice Born Men* illustrate what drastic transformations in personality are possible through religious experience.

Granted the wide variations which are bound to occur because of differences in heredity, there is still reason to believe that the development of a desirable type of personality is a process which is largely within human control. This is not to leave out of account the co-operation of divine forces in the process, but merely to assume that when we as human leaders and teachers have done our best, we may count upon the constant co-operation of the Divine.

How does personality develop? Aside from hereditary variations, why is one person so different from another? Even twins do not have identical heredity, due to the infinite variety of combinations in the germ plasm. Generally speaking, however, they may be assumed to have about an equal start in life. If a pair of twins were separated at birth, one being reared in the slums of a city and the other in a well-to-do country home, wide variations would develop in the two personalities. Why? Because of widely different experiences. Whether a boy goes to college or goes to work in a factory profoundly affects the personality that the later adolescent years will develop. Going to summer conference or camp has wrought seemingly profound changes in young men and women in a few days. The controlled situation of a campground makes possible a unique experience. One's personality, within the limits set by heredity—which are usually generous—is due simply to the experiences which he has had. Personality is a product of experience.

This is not to imply that the person passively submits to experience. He does not wait quietly for something to happen to him. Personality is not a victim of environment. Healthy personality is aggressive, continually in quest of experience and actively selecting the experiences which will be had from a much wider range of possibilities. This questing and these selections are upon the basis of values which previous experience has established. Originally these values are due to native impulses or predispositions, but they can very early begin to be controlled by controlling the situations in which certain experiences will be sought. Personality is a product of experience plus the way in which the individual reacts to specific experiences.

If we desire to produce in a child a certain type of personality, the requirements are quite simple, even though the process of meeting them may be highly complex and difficult. First, we need to learn what kind of experiences produce the desired type of personality. Secondly, we need to make it possible for the individual to have those experiences and to be free from those of an opposite or contrary character. Thirdly, the desirable experiences must be made available in such attractive form or on the basis of such strong motives that they will be desired and sought by the individual.

A Christlike personality develops out of Christlike experiences. If the church would develop Christlike persons, it is necessary to provide opportunity for Christlike experiences and to induce persons to choose these experiences and to shun those which interfere with the desired outcome. This means that the church's total program should consist of experiences through which persons and groups are learning Christlike living and achieving Christlike character.

Obviously, we cannot reproduce in the lives of present-day youth all the experiences which Jesus had. The experience of being a Jewish lad in a peasant carpenter's home, of attending a synagogue school, of speaking the Aramaic language, and of wearing Oriental clothing, is neither possible nor essential in the development of Christlike persons. Jesus' own personality in its universal essentials was not dependent upon such accidental factors.

Through what types of experience did the essentials of Jesus' personality develop? What were the unique experiences not appropriated by other Jewish lads of his day through which his own characteristics were achieved?

Foremost, probably, was his God-consciousness, his sense of immediate communion with God, and his experience of God as a loving Father. "But," objects someone, "Jesus sustained a unique relationship to God. No one else can enter into that experience"—an objection more theological than empirical. To be sure, none of his followers has achieved that relationship, nor has any achieved his personality. If it is Christlike personality we seek, we must not foredoom ourselves to failure by prejudging its possibility. Perhaps if the experience of Jesus in this respect could more nearly be approximated, his type of personality could more nearly be achieved. There is no use raising a theoretical argument about going the whole way until a sufficient start has been made to test out the possibilities. We do Jesus less reverence when we hold him to be impossible as an ideal than when we sincerely set out to become like him.

The immediate experience of God comes through worship. That is the precise aim of a properly conducted worship program. It is the aim and method also of private devotions in so far as they are real and vital. The church should seek through worship to lead every individual, from the youngest babe to the most venerable saint, into an experience of direct communion with God in terms of the experience background of each.

Much of the richness of Jesus' own personality was due to his social heritage as a member of the Jewish race. The devotional literature of his people, with its beauty and purity of expression, its consciousness of the reality and personality of God, and its sense of God's concern for his people, formed the prayer book and hymn book of his youth. He stood in the line of the old prophets whose idealism he shared and whose fearless struggle against intrenched wrong he took up. He did them honor rather than dishonor when he went beyond them in his concept of the kingdom of God and his devotion to the cause of the underprivileged and unloved who were exploited by a formal religion.

It was because he knew so well the treasures which his people had inherited from the past and also the current trends and aspirations of his day, that Jesus was able to reinterpret them into new and vastly larger patterns. The personality of Jesus was due in some measure at least to learning in youth this rich body of racial literature and experience.

✓ Perhaps the most characteristic thing about Jesus was that "he went about doing good." His attitude or habit of helpfulness is evident in every situation. Startling as it must have been to the quarreling twelve, Jesus did few things that were more "just like him" than the washing of the disciples' feet. One of the dominant types of his experience is described by that much overworked word "service." They who would be Christlike must experience his eager desire to be helpful and his warm sense of satisfaction in deeds well done. Because his helpfulness was prompted by sincere love, it was never performed with conscious sacrifice, or simply as a duty. His attitude toward his fellow men being what it was, his deeds of service were spontaneous, inevitable.

Jesus' love of companionship was one of the marked traits of his personality. His table talk and bits of casual conversation with individuals and informal groups comprise much of the choicest of his recorded sayings. He was a frequent and welcome banquet guest. The lure of his personality called men from their vocations to be with him continually. In spite of his uncompromising message, his popularity at times embarrassed him. In accounting for the experiences which contributed to his personality, we must count fellowship, and fellowship upon the fine and lofty plane to which it was inevitably pitched in his presence, as among the dominant factors.

If the church in its constituency would develop Christlike persons, then she must see to it that they have these experiences as nearly on the plane of the Christlike as possible—experiences of worship, of learning the religious heritage, of service, and of fellowship. The church's program really becomes, therefore, a curriculum of Christlike experiences. These must be made so attractive in themselves, or motives prompting the choice of them must be so developed, that these experiences will be chosen and purposefully carried out by the church's constituency.

This process of bringing about desirable changes in persons through enriched and guided experience is necessarily gradual and continuous. As long as a person is capable of having experience, so long does this development, potentially at least, continue. We have a process, therefore, which begins very early in life and continues until the end of life, if the necessary experiences are available and are sought. Because childhood and youth are most flexible and responsive to experiences, the process is most rapid and most subject to control in the earlier years. The more largely the church's program tends to be youth-centered, therefore, the better chance it has for success and the larger will be the returns on the invested effort.

To say that the process is gradual and continuous, however, is not to say that it proceeds evenly. Experience itself is not like the even flow of the placid river. It is not even regular like the ebb and flow of the tide. Rather it is irregular and spasmodic like the waters of the lake which now lie motionless and calm, now ripple gently in the breeze, and again are lashed into fury by the tempest.

Experiences have all degrees of intensity. Their personality-forming influence is largely in proportion to their intensity. This means that the development of any desired type of personality is subject to sudden spurts of progress and to periods in which little gain seems to be made. Psychologists would tell us that the "plateaus of learning" in which progress seems to be at a standstill are, as a matter of fact, inevitable. It is during these periods that the sudden gains are being "set in" or confirmed so that they become stable and permanent. All learning is subject to the same irregular progress.

All learning, in fact, is but a process of effecting desirable changes in persons through experience. The method of education is the direction, control, and enrichment of experience. Given the personality outcome desired, whether it be speed and accuracy in typewriting, the interpretation of a sonata, or a life of service on the mission field, the process of achieving that outcome is to discover and provide the experiences necessary or conducive to it, and then to induce or stimulate the individual to choose those experiences.

Modern education is no longer a mere process of instruction or transmission. It conceives the curriculum as the experience of the pupil which is brought within the controlled environment and under the skilled leadership of the school, for the purpose of enrichment and direction, toward the desired type of personality.

The present-day school, committed to this philosophy, achieves surprising results.[2] Its program is one of activities in which pupils engage wholeheartedly because they have chosen them and are working toward definite ends which they see and know. Its most valuable aspect is the experience of participation in interesting social enterprises in which responsibility is carried and initiative is enjoyed.

Time was when there seemed to be little in common between the procedure in a schoolroom and the type of rich personal and social experience out of which the traits of Christlike personality might be expected to emerge. To-day the process of education as conceived in the more progressive school and the process of developing Christlike personality as conceived in the progressive church have everything in common except their specific objectives and the nature of the activities and experiences required. In method they are identical.

---

[2] See Collings, *An Experiment With a Project Curriculum,* The Macmillan Company, New York.

It is evident, therefore, that the purpose of the church requires the educational process and that the method and program of the church are essentially educational. If it is the function of the church to provide and motivate those activities and experiences out of which Christlike personality develops, the church's program becomes a schedule of typical Christian activities for each age group. In other words, the church becomes a school in Christian living.

Does this conception of the church as a school rule God out of the process? The "operation of the Holy Spirit" in conversion as a miraculous or supernatural intervention to remake the individual, is usually thought of as over against anything so natural and gradual as an educational process.

In the first place, "conversion," while it marks a crisis point, is not the sudden reconstruction of a personality which is so easily assumed. Gradual and sometimes long and patient preparation has been made for the event. It takes the cumulative effect of appeal upon appeal in succession to induce the decisive step. After the step has been taken the process of a reconstructed personality is but begun. Unless weeks and months of experience in overcoming temptation and in building up habits of righteousness follow the step of conversion, a well-integrated Christian personality will never develop. After all, conversion is but one dramatic episode in a long process and has its real significance only in the success of all the personality-forming experiences of which it is the most intense.

In the second place, to recognize the unusual intensity and dramatic quality of one experience, preceded and followed by others related to it but of less intensity, is not to rule conversion out of the educational process. It is merely to note that this learning process, like others, is subject to its sudden crisis points and to its "plateaus" of apparently little progress. Whether conversion be from a life of flagrant sin or merely from indecision and uncertainty, there is nothing about it which does not belong normally in an educational process, the earlier stages of which have been misdirected, ineffectual, or merely preparatory. Obviously, however, if from the earliest years experiences typical of the Christian life are available and are chosen by the individual, "conversion" will be but a personal commitment positively to ideals which have already been taken for granted. It will have no such dramatic intensity as would be involved in the radical disturbance of a personality in the case of a "right-about-face" type of conversion.

But have we not made matters worse? Granted that there seemed little place for the operation of the Holy Spirit aside from conversion, by reducing conversion to a mere intensity in the educational process, haven't we eliminated divine forces altogether? It is a peculiar but common fallacy to miss

God entirely in his most characteristic modes of expression, and to think we find him in the spectacular. We are so thrilled by the earthquake and wind and fire that we miss the still small voice. God's almost universal method is the quiet, gradual, unobtrusive one. He seldom resorts to drastic measures. There is as much reason for saying that the operation of the Holy Spirit is in the daily habit of well-doing of the growing Christian as in the emotional upheaval of the penitent convert. The latter type of experience will have little fruitful significance until it leads to the former. When the ideals embraced in conversion have been built into daily habits and unconscious attitudes, there is no reason to say that the Holy Spirit has gone out of the process. The fallacy of identifying his operation with emotional upheavals is self-evident.

The teacher who works quietly from week to week seeking to guide the growing person into a truer insight in spiritual matters, and into a more consistent Christian practice in daily conduct, has as much assurance of the co-operation of the Holy Spirit as has the evangelist who convicts the sinner. Unfortunately, the teacher has often assumed that his or her part of the process was a merely human undertaking; that after this human process of teaching and learning had been carried to a certain point, the students should be turned over to professional leadership who would in some mysterious way bring about conversion and decision through the co-operation of divine forces. The seeding and cultivation are the work of the teacher, the harvest that of the evangelist.

There is no reason why we should cast reflection upon the methods used to bring about decision. The sacred responsibility of pressing the gospel invitation has been abused and cheapened by unscrupulous manipulators who were chiefly concerned with statistics and self-glory. Such abuses, especially when used to take advantage of children, are reprehensible. The sincere, straightforward appeal for allegiance to Christ, on the other hand, is the highest office open to humankind. The person who undertakes it does well to be conscious of those divine forces with which he co-operates and without which he must fail. Any teacher of the Christian religion, however, falls short of his high calling until this step in the teaching procedure is reached. Not only at that point but all along the way he does well to be conscious of and to depend upon the co-operation of the Divine. What we need is not a lower conception of the evangelistic office, but a higher conception and practice of the teaching function. There is nothing in Scripture, in experience, or in psychology which promises greater divine co-operation to the one than to the other.

The "church as a school" draws upon every resource of the Divine which is available for the "church as an evangelizing agency." In addition, the "church as a school" draws upon the most effective and powerful techniques and instruments known to man through psychology and educational research in effecting desirable changes in persons. Only the church which meets and matches the divine co-operation with this most effective means of human co-operation, is true to the purpose and method of Jesus.

This conception of the church as a school in Christian living calls for a radical reconstruction of the traditional church program. It will make Christian religious education, instead of a subordinate side issue carried by auxiliaries, the basic method and the central phase of the total program. It means that the person who directs and supervises the educational program really directs the total church, since every aspect of the total church life will necessarily be subservient to the educational objectives and methods. It means that the total resources of the church will be laid under tribute to these same objectives. It means that the office of the minister as traditionally conceived and commonly practiced is totally inadequate, if, indeed, not quite obsolete. The conception of the church here presented calls for a new type of professional leadership, differently trained and functioning in quite a different way from the traditional ministry.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Betts, George H., *The New Program of Religious Education*, The Abingdon Press, Chapters III, IV, V, VI.

Betts, George H., *How to Teach Religion*, The Abingdon Press, Chapter II.

Betts and Hawthorne, *Method in Teaching Religion*, The Abingdon Press, Chapters I and III.

Bower, W. C., *Religious Education in the Modern Church*, Saint Louis: Bethany Press, Chapters II, V.

Bower, W. C., *The Curriculum of Religious Education*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, Chapters IV, XV.

Coe, George A., *What Is Christian Education?* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, Chapters III–VII.

Fiske, G. Walter, *Purpose in Teaching Religion*, The Abingdon Press, Chapter IV.

Munro, Harry C., *The Church as a School*, Saint Louis: Bethany Press, Chapter II.

Powell, Wilfred E., *The Growth of Christian Personality*, Saint Louis: Bethany Press, Chapters VII–X.

Soares, Theodore G., *Religious Education*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Chapters II, VII–XII.

Stout, John Elbert, *Organization and Administration of Religious Education*, The Abingdon Press, Chapters I, II, and III.

Vieth, Paul H., *Teaching for Christian Living*, Saint Louis: Bethany Press, Chapter II.

CHAPTER VI

CAN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION REMAIN A LAYMAN'S MOVEMENT?

Religious education is as old as religion itself. Otherwise, the religious experiences, achievements, and institutions of each generation must perish with it. Only through an educational process in which religious persons share their experiences with their contemporaries and their children can religious experience become cumulative and its institutions develop and survive. It is quite obvious, therefore, that some form of Christian religious education dates from the origin of Christianity. The Christian religion originated with a Great Teacher and has been most successfully propagated and perpetuated as his own methods have been imitated.

The Sunday-school movement, however, out of which the modern church school has largely developed, began as a definite program only a century and a half ago. Robert Raikes, a benevolent editor of Gloucester, England, deplored the illiteracy and rascality of the children of the poverty-stricken industrial class. Especially on Sunday, when freed from their labor in factories, did these children infest the streets and alleys, bent on all kinds of deviltry. Raikes started a school for them, employing women to teach them reading, writing, numbering, and Bible. It was called a Sunday school though philanthropic rather than definitely religious in its purpose.

Marked improvement was noted in the behavior of the children and the general tone of the communities where these Sunday schools were launched. Raikes became enthusiastic about their possibilities, and after four years of experimentation gave the movement favorable publicity in his periodicals. Others became interested, persons of high social standing volunteered as teachers, and within four more years a quarter of a million children were being reached by the Sunday school in English industrial centers.

It was strictly a layman's movement. The first school was held in Raikes' home. Later the use of church buildings was secured, though with difficulty in some cases. With few exceptions the clergy were indifferent or openly hostile. The Archbishop of Canterbury called a conference of bishops to consider ways of stopping the alarming growth of the movement. There are many stories of persecution encountered at the hands of ardent churchmen by those conducting and promoting the Sunday school. Its greatest patrons were for the most part laymen like Raikes.

The Wesley movement, however, gave strong impetus to the Sunday school. In being transplanted to America it lost something of the stigma of its lowly origin, though the clergy opposed it here also in many cases. The example of Horace Bushnell, the greatest molder of religious thought in his day, finally brought the Sunday school into good repute and gave it real prestige. It became recognized also as an effective recruitment agency for church membership and came finally to be accepted as a definite part of the church's program.

To this day, however, the Sunday school has never quite outgrown its early history when it was a layman's movement, ignored or openly opposed by the clergy. Throughout its history laymen have furnished its leadership and its most vigorous promotion. Of all the twenty-two national and international Sunday-school conventions, only three have had clergymen as presidents. The executive committees of the various conventions and of the International Sunday School Association were predominantly made up of the laity. One has but to recall the names of W. N. Hartshorn, H. J. Heinz, John Wanamaker, and Russell Colgate as typical of the Sunday-school leadership which has been supplied by prominent business men.

Not only have the great conventions illustrated in their leadership the prominence of laity, but the field organization developed under the International Sunday School Association drew almost entirely, and with quite conscious intent, upon lay officers and workers. It has been a well-defined policy among Sunday-school leaders generally to keep the Sunday school largely a layman's organization. The ministry, generally speaking, has acquiesced in this policy, interpreting Sunday-school work as quite within the capacities of earnest lay workers, and as hardly justifying much attention from the busy professional leader of the church. Thus, from the convention system at the top, down to the administration and program of the local church, Sunday-school work has been the layman's responsibility and task.

This policy has had distinct advantages. It has made available to the church vast resources of strength, talent, and devotion which never would have been secured under a different policy. It has been the means of opening to the church membership the greatest avenue of voluntary Christian service available. Not only has this service itself been of much intrinsic worth; the opportunity of rendering it has given vitality and fruitfulness to the Christian experience of thousands who otherwise might have been quite barren and inactive Christians. While Sunday-school work was a simple, nontechnical rule-of-thumb process it was probably more wholesome to have responsibility for it fixed chiefly on the laity than otherwise.

As long as public education was a mere transmissive process, requiring no training of its teachers except familiarity with its subject matter, religious education of the same type could, with but a little Bible drill, provide a teaching staff about as well trained as the public-school staff. Neither public nor religious education demanded technical knowledge beyond the printed text or skill beyond the art of quizzing in a recitation. Discipline was a conscious factor, but it was recognized only as an educational obstacle—never an educational opportunity. When each is compared with the contemporary general education of its day, the average Sunday school of the nineteenth century was far superior to the average church school of to-day.

This is because the educative process itself has come to be conceived in very different terms. Instead of being a simple process of transmitting knowledge through instruction and drill, it has come to be recognized as a highly complex process of guiding and enriching the experience of the pupil in the adjustments which life forces upon him. Insight into the nature of the pupils' experiences and how they are conditioned, knowledge of the wide resources available for guiding and enriching those experiences, and skill in the use of the varied means and techniques required to effect desired outcomes in the pupils' personalities—mastery in all these difficult fields is required of the properly trained teacher of to-day. And in these respects the demands upon the teacher of religion are even more exacting than upon the teacher in any other field, due to the specific goals of religious education.

These revolutionary developments in the philosophy and practice of public education have quite properly and inevitably been reflected in religious education during the first quarter of the present century. The recruiting value of the Sunday school had already become so well recognized that overhead administrative and promotional agencies had been established by the denominations. These for the most part threw their influence on the side of progress. Graded lessons appeared. Careful reorganization of the school took place. Denominations began to employ trained educational specialists to administer and improve their work. The old Sunday-school movement was soon converted into "religious education," prophetic of a complete renaissance in the church's teaching ministry.

It is no more possible to return to the old-fashioned Sunday school as an effective agency of Christian education in our day than it is to return to the oxcart as an effective conveyance. One is as out of gear with modern life as the other. Whether religious education will be technical and exacting of its leadership or not, is neither a matter of taste nor of opinion. If it continues at all, it will be consistent in method and in quality with education as a whole. To choose to continue a type of Sunday-school work characteristic of a former generation is to choose sooner or later to abandon religious education altogether. The work of the church school will become increasingly technical and exacting of its leadership, but it will partake of other characteristics of modern education as well—it will be vastly more effective in its realization of well-defined aims. It will become an increasingly powerful instrument of individual development and of social progress.

But now that religious education has become technical, the untrained lay leadership under which it has thrived through the years is no longer adequate to guide and supervise it. While the church school will still provide the greatest opportunity in the church for large numbers of laymen and laywomen to render a distinctive voluntary service, these workers must be trained if this service is to be effective, and their work must be directed by a supervisor who understands the full technique of a modern religious educational program.

A comparison of the goals or objectives of Christian religious education with those of public education will reveal something of the difficulties faced by the religious educator and the exacting demands made upon him if he would succeed.

The aims of public education have long since passed far beyond the mere impartation of knowledge or the conduct of drill. Typical of the guiding principles of public-school work during the whole period since the close of the World War, is this statement made in 1918 by the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education appointed by the National Education Association: "Education in a democracy, both within and without the school, should develop in each individual the knowledge, interests, ideals, habits, and powers whereby he will find his place and use that place to shape both himself and society toward ever nobler ends."[1]

We have already quoted a statement made ten years later by the Commission on the Curriculum of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, which should be reread in this connection (see pages 23, 24). There is evidence here of a still greater emphasis upon the development of personality and a definite commitment to a religious view of life as an indispensable factor therein. Public education here recognizes its inability to carry the process to its logical and needful climax without religion. Its unsolved problem is not whether to include religion. It has committed itself on this. The problem awaiting solution is *how* the religious factor is to be included in the comprehensive goals of any complete education.

It will be a sad day for the church when public education looks elsewhere for the solution to this problem. It is just at this point that the similarity and the difference between the work of the public school and that of the church school become apparent. The church school seeks to undo nothing that the public school, with these lofty aims, has done. It does not work in a different direction, nor upon different principles. It is the high function of the church school to pick up and complete the educational process at the point where the public school has reached the limits of its resources and its function—at the point where ethical character merges into Christian personality, and is undergirded by the sanctions and the experiences of religion. Both work with the same raw material of human nature. Both deal with developing personalities who are struggling for wholeness and integrity. Both use the resources of racial experience, of individual experience, of social pressure, and of personal influence. The public school brings the process to the point where religious beliefs, personal commitment to a definite religious ideal, and communion with God through the experience of worship are necessary in creating motives and embodying ideals in the concrete. Working simultaneously religious education completes the process, carrying it through its highest phases in which all that has gone before receives interpretation, evaluation, and motive power.

---

[1] "Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education," U. S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1918, No. 35, p. 9. The seven cardinal principles stated are: Health, command of fundamental processes, worthy home-membership, vocation, citizenship, worthy use of leisure, and ethical character.

As the child passes regularly from one school to the other he is always the same growing, changing child. From his standpoint, it is all one process, though shared by several institutions. Of the total enterprise of growth and personality development which is under way in that life, the share of the church school, while narrower in scope, is far more difficult and exacting in kind. If a technically skilled leadership is required in the public-school phase of education, then certainly an equally well-qualified leadership is even more essential in this highest and most difficult phase of the process, for which the church school is responsible.

The objectives of Christian religious education as interpreted by the Educational Commission of the International Council of Religious Education will make still clearer the relationship of the two phases of the process, and the greater difficulty of the religious phase just because it does set its goals higher.

I. Religious education seeks to foster in growing persons a consciousness of God as a reality in human experience, and a sense of personal relationship to him.

II. Religious education seeks to develop in growing persons such an understanding and appreciation of the personality, life, and teachings of Jesus as will lead to discovery of him as Saviour and Lord, loyalty to him and his cause, and manifest itself in daily life and conduct.

III. Religious education seeks to foster in growing persons a progressive and continuous development of Christlike character.

IV. Religious education seeks to develop in growing persons the ability and disposition to participate in and contribute constructively to the building of a social order embodying the ideal of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

V. Religious education seeks to develop in growing persons the ability and disposition to participate in the organized society of Christians—the church.

VI. Religious education seeks to lead growing persons into a Christian interpretation of life and the universe;

the ability to see in it God's purpose and plan; a life philosophy built on this interpretation.

VII. Religious education seeks to effect in growing persons the assimilation of the best religious experience of the race, as effective guidance to present experience.[2]

In attaining its goals Christian religious education draws upon resources not available for free use in the public schools. It holds before its students the one perfect embodiment of character and encourages them to cultivate a sense of fellowship with Him. It leads its students into the experience of worship from which come the strongest incentives to live up to the ideals held before them. It introduces them into a religious fellowship or family life in which God is assumed as a real member of the group. These resources or techniques upon which the church school has so largely a monopoly enable it to set its goals beyond those of the public school with hope still of realizing them.

However, if the church school is to secure the full benefit of these resources of the personality of Jesus and the experience of worship, it will be only through a skilled leadership. Nothing attempted in the public school is so difficult as to measure up to the full demands of this task. To transform the traditional Sunday school into a vital fellowship where these enriching and empowering experiences are fruitfully provided is the task of no mere novice. Unquestionably, the modern church school requires a technically skilled leadership if it is to discharge its share of the total educational function. To seek to continue as the movement of benevolent but untrained laymen or laywomen is to fail the public school, the community, the church, and, above all, the generation of to-morrow's world, in the genuine educational crisis which is upon us.

---

[2] Quoted by permission of the International Council of Religious Education.

Unless the church school keeps pace with other agencies which make their effective appeals for attention and allegiance, youth itself will eliminate its program as a factor in his life. The coming of the radio, the motion picture and talkie, and the sensational press has made the task of the church-school teacher many times more difficult; not simply because these agencies present wrong ideals, but, rather, because whatever they present is done with so much greater artistry and skill than was the case with any appeal to interest a generation ago. Time was when Sunday school was about as interesting and exciting as anything else in which one could participate. Spelling bees, singing schools, literary societies, country dances, and buggy rides were the other thrills available. Competition for the interest and allegiance of youth was neither sharp nor insistent. But how can a church school justify its appeal to youth to-day, in the eyes of youth himself? Whatever else it may be, it must at least be interesting. And the interests to which it must appeal are those jaded by every clever device of our jazz-mad age.

This is not to imply that the church enter into competition with these agencies on their own level. No greater mistake could be made, for it will not outdo them, and its attempt will likely be pathetically asinine. Rather what it does in its own field on its own level must be *well done.* Youth must be convinced that church-school leaders "know their stuff." The materials and methods used must be of a quality to command respect or, better still, admiration. When as careful attention is given to architecture, mural decoration, lighting effects, music, and general setting to create atmosphere for a worship service as the theater uses to create its desired emotional effects, youth will respect the church for its sheer skill in technique, and he will as well make the desired emotional response. Church-school leaders deal with a generation bombarded from morning till night by advertising and entertainment so skillfully purveyed that any influence whatever upon their lives can be exerted only by means equally skillful.

The whole trend in public education tends to create the finest background for effective religious education. Yet the very excellence of the public-school program sets exacting standards for the church school. The church-school teacher may never think to compare the quality of her work with that of the teacher in the corresponding public-school grade. She may never take the trouble to visit the public school or keep in touch with the backgrounds which it is continually supplying for her work. But her students go back and forth from one school to the other with comparison, conscious or unconscious, inevitable. What if the church and religion suffer in this comparison?

Out of every hour which Johnnie spends under the influence of a teacher, fifty-nine minutes of it are spent with his public-school teacher. The other one minute is spent with his church-school teacher. In that one minute it is her high privilege to interpret, to motivate, to impregnate with Christian meaning and values, all the growth and achievements of the other fifty-nine minutes. What if the fifty-nine are spent under a teacher who is well trained for her task? She knows what she wants to do and how to do it. But the one minute is spent under a bungling novice who "kindly consented" to take the class until someone else could be secured! The fact that this one precious minute is wasted is not the chief tragedy. What kind of an estimate is that boy getting of the church and its work as compared with other institutions?

Because of its lofty and difficult objectives, because of the sharp and persistent competition for enlisting the interest and allegiance of its students which it must face, because of the necessity that its work compare favorably with that of the public school if it is to maintain the respect of its students—for all these reasons the church school must face the necessity of providing a responsible, technically trained professional leadership. While lay voluntary service will constitute the great bulk of its leadership, supervision must be provided which will insure a program of worthy quality. Religious education can no longer remain primarily a layman's movement.

Church-school and church leaders have from time to time sensed the need of professional supervision and have sought a redefinition of the pastor's function so as to relate him in a responsible way to this aspect of the church's work. As early as 1869 at the Fourth National Sunday School Convention held in Newark, New Jersey, a Pastors' Section drew up a report in part as follows:

> They [pastors] devoutly thank God for the enlarged

interest, improved facilities, and multiplied successes of the Sunday-school work, as indicated in this national gathering.

They recognize their relation to the work as of the closest and most solemn kind. The pastor, by virtue of his office, being the acknowledged head of the Sunday school, should constantly exercise such supervision as will detect and correct unfaithfulness in superintendents, teachers, or other workers of the school. He should, by sermons and addresses, as also by his personal communication with parents, officers, teachers, and scholars, endeavor to instruct them in all that may promote their efficiency and glorify our Lord. This supervision and instruction to be given in no authoritative way, but in the spirit of brotherly kindness and Christian consideration.

They believe that no one system of preaching to children can be prescribed for all places, and times, and diversities of talent; but they firmly believe that the services of the sanctuary should be carefully adapted to the capacities and wants of all Christ's little ones.

In subsequent conventions the pastor's relation to his Sunday school is a recurrent theme handled both by representative pastors and by Sunday-school specialists. The unvarying position taken is that the pastor rightly carries specific responsibility for supervision of the Sunday school and for promoting its interests in every way. The implication frequently is that this relationship is not generally recognized either by pastor or by people, and that there is an unwholesome tendency for church and school to pull apart, each largely ignoring the other, and the pastor being identified with the church only.

As early as 1881 the Rev. H. A. Thompson, in addressing the International Sunday School Convention at Toronto on "The Sunday School and the Seminary," deplored the small place given to the pastor's Sunday-school responsibility in his seminary training. A survey of the provision made for preparing ministers for their Sunday-school leadership had revealed a pitiful lack of attention to this duty.

A quarter of a century later Dr. George B. Stewart, president of Auburn Theological Seminary, addressed the International Convention again meeting in Toronto on "The Sunday School and the Minister's Training." After saying that "there is no single part of a minister's work more important than the Sunday school," he described a very slowly improving situation in the seminaries with reference to proper training. He blamed the churches, however, for the failure of the seminary to respond to this need, for the seminaries were "only a little, if any, behind the church in regard for this great arm of the church. . . . It was only yesterday that she [the church] came to think enough of the Sunday school to feel that the minister ought to be an expert in its work."

In his able discussion[3] of the minister's educational responsibility in the Lyman Beecher Lectures at Yale University in 1908, President William H. P. Faunce, of Brown University, said:

> No strong and enduring people ever yet existed without definite and continuous work in religious education. If reverence does not "grow from more to more," the

---

[3] William H. P. Faunce, *The Educational Ideal in the Ministry*, pp. 199-201. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company, publishers, New York.

nation is palsied at its very heart. Since the state cannot, and the home usually does not, undertake religious instruction, what is the duty of the church?

Naturally, we think first of the Sunday school. No other institution of our age shows such a chasm between possibility and performance. No other has such vast powers latent and unused.

Here, then, is the unrivaled opportunity of the modern pastor. He finds close at hand a sword already fashioned, but rusty and sticking to its scabbard. He has not to begin the work of religious education—it was begun in the Sunday school more than a century ago. He has not to induce his church to organize a school, to appoint teachers, or to set apart some time for instruction. The machinery is at hand, though antiquated and creaking, and sometimes a mass of revolving wheels that achieve no output. To take this mechanism, remodel it to suit present need, to harness it to new sources of power, and put it in charge of the most vital and forceful personalities in the community—this is the pastor's imperative task. No other form of work will bring so rich results. Vastly more important than the annual round of pastoral calls, which may degenerate into mere social simpering, far more promising than any young people's societies, more rewarding than all guilds, settlements, leagues, and clubs of every kind, is the fundamental and essential work of directing the religious education of the congregation. The pastor who succeeds as educational director cannot fail otherwise. His church has touched the ultimate springs of power.

In 1911 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. made the following pronouncement regarding responsibility for general oversight of the Sunday school: "This business of supervision belongs to the pastor and session."

The present *Discipline* of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South,[4] squarely fixes responsibility for organization, maintenance, and supervision of the Sunday school upon the pastor, though a special educational ministry is authorized for larger churches.

At its quadrennial meeting in May, 1928, The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church took the following action: "The pastor shall have general supervision of religious education in the local church. It shall be his responsibility to develop in the church or churches of his charge a definitely formulated program of religious education, organized in harmony with the disciplinary provisions and in such way as effectively to carry out the curriculum of studies approved by the Board of Education. He shall give attention to the training of teachers and leaders and to the enlistment of children and young people in the work of the church, and, on appropriate occasions, shall present the claim of full-time Christian service."

The point of view represented in these significant actions is becoming sufficiently prevalent theoretically so that, with another generation of ministers, the educational responsibility of the church's professional leader will likely be well recognized and widely accepted.

While the educational responsibility of the local minister has for sixty years been theoretically recognized from time to time, this has had little practical bearing upon the actual situation. Sunday-school work has continued as a lay movement, and the ministry has continued to be identified with an aspect of the church's program which was not recognized as having educational possibilities or needing educational methods. Vigorous propaganda will still be needed, both among the church membership and the ministry, before the ideals set forth in any of these statements of pastoral responsibility for the church school are realized.

---

[4] *Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*, 1926, pp. 186-88.

During the first eight years of remarkable development of the International Council of Religious Education, professional advisory sections were constituted of practically every professional group having anything whatever to do with the work of religious education, except the one professional group which is in a position to make the program a success or a failure in the vast majority of churches—the pastors. There were sections composed of the following groups: Children's Work Section, Young People's Section, Adult Work Section, Directors' of Religious Education Section, Editors' Section, Publishers' Section, International and National Executives' Section, State and Regional Executives' Section, City Executives' Section, Professors' of Religious Education Section, Week-day Church Schools Section, Vacation Church Schools Section, Leadership Training Section, Negro Work Section, Missionary Education Section, and Research Section.

The fact that it did not occur to pastors to organize themselves and apply for professional standing in the International Council as a Pastors' Advisory Section, indicates how detached the ministry still was from the whole religious educational movement. The fact that leaders in the Council delayed so long taking the initiative in organizing pastors, shows how largely religious education was still conscious of itself as a lay movement, in spite of the many professional groups, other than the ministry, who had become closely identified with it.

The effective work of many of our best seminaries in preparing a qualified ministry, the possible organization of a Pastors' Section in the International Council of Religious Education, the increasing place of the ministry in leadership training enterprises both as students and teachers, and the experiments in pastoral supervision under way here and there, promise in the near future a much fuller realization of these ideals of an educational ministry.

In the meantime the situation has become complicated by the development rather suddenly of a new profession—the director of religious education in the local church. In the early years of the century it became evident that religious education was becoming too technical and complex a process, covering too wide a scope of agencies, materials, and methods, to remain longer a lay movement. Professional leadership became indispensable to those churches seriously attempting the new program.

Influential leaders in the field did not at that time generally advocate the policy which, as it has since appeared, is the only one available for the vast majority of churches. They did not propose a redefinition of the pastor's function to include this basic responsibility. Perhaps it did not occur to them. Perhaps they despaired of effecting the necessary changes in pastor and congregation. Whatever the reason, this demand for professional educational leadership in the local church was met by launching a new profession with a very definite professional consciousness, and an idealism similar to that of the preceding missionary recruitment movement.

The seminary and church college, which had so long lagged behind the need for ministry trained for church-school leadership, now responded vigorously to the demand to train an entirely new profession. Nearly every seminary and church college launched its chair or department of religious education. The vocational aspects were emphasized. The unfortunate result was that, with this fine training now available for the ministry, it became so largely identified with the new profession that ministerial students continued, in the main, on the even tenor of their way in the traditional seminary course.

The implications of the vigorous promotion given the new profession were that every church must have a director of religious education if it was to have a modern program. For the large church able to provide a multiplicity of professional leadership, this involved no great difficulties. Many proceeded to employ directors as soon as they were available. In fact, the demand was so vigorous for a time that a number were employed whose academic training was much below that of the pastor in the same church. It became the ideal of nearly every progressive church to have its employed director of religious education sooner or later. Even small churches set this as a proper even though distant goal.

For example, a widely used leadership training textbook, published in 1921, giving a most able treatment of the church's teaching work, assumed the director as typical of the normal situation. After describing the method of constituting and organizing the educational committee or board of religious education, it named the first duty of this board as the calling of a director of religious education. The director's functions were then described and the whole program laid out on the assumption of an employed specialist. The voluntary superintendent was casually mentioned, but the pastor-supervisor was quite out of the picture. Yet this book represented the widest current judgment of its day, for it was approved in manuscript form by many denominations as a text and used by them in large numbers.

By the third decade of the present century the ideal of religious education as a layman's movement had pretty well given way to that of a program requiring at least professionally trained and employed supervision. Indeed, a growing sentiment, supported by successful practice here and there, was committed not only to employed professional supervision, but an employed teaching staff as well.

But the employment of a professional leadership for religious education, simple enough in theory, involved many knotty problems. For the vast majority of churches it was financially prohibitive. In the few able to employ directors there were difficulties of personnel, pastor-director relationships, and too much theorizing with insufficient practical leadership. But the problems involved in the new profession must have fuller treatment in another chapter.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Betts, George H., *The New Program of Religious Education*, The Abingdon Press, Chapter VII.

Bower, W. C., *Religious Education in the Modern Church*, Saint Louis: Bethany Press, Chapters III, VI.

Brown, Arlo A., *A History of Religious Education in Recent Times*, The Abingdon Press, Chapters II to VII.

Fiske, G. Walter, *Purpose in Teaching Religion*, The Abingdon Press, Chapter II.

Munro, Harry C., *The Church as a School*, Saint Louis: Bethany Press, Chapter I.

Shaver, Erwin L., *Present-Day Trends in Religious Education*, Boston: The Pilgrim Press, Chapters I–IV.

CHAPTER VII

DOES A DIRECTOR SOLVE THE PROBLEM?

While the goal of thousands of pastors and congregations has doubtless been to employ a professional director of religious education, only a few hundred have been able to do so. This has probably been due much more to financial limitations than to lack of available personnel.

The new profession has not had smooth sailing in many cases. Tenure of office has been brief and status somewhat precarious. It is not unusual to find ministers who, having had one or two experiences with directors, are radically opposed to another attempt, and have little use for the new profession as such. With equal frequency one encounters directors who feel that their work has been hindered or rendered impossible by lack of appreciation or co-operation on the part of the pastor.

It is somewhat reassuring that the two questionnaire studies[1] which have been made of the profession found the attitudes of pastors generally favorable. The responses, however, indicate a good many problems of personal relationship, of professional rank, and of definition of function, which await solution in numerous situations. There is inadequate evidence that the mere calling of a director solves all the educational problems of the pastor and his church. Sometimes it seems but to create many new ones.

---

[1] International Council of Religious Education, Research Service Bulletin, Vol. I, Nos. 3 and 4, July and October, 1926, "A Study of the Personnel and Work of the Office of Director of Religious Education."

Boston University Bulletin, Vol. XVII, No. 24, August 13, 1928, "Attitudes of the Ministry toward the Director of Religious Education," Alfred J. Wright.

Problems apparently growing largely out of the personal limitations of the director appear in many cases. He is charged with being an impractical technician, interested more in reports, statistics, and other mechanics than in spiritual matters and personalities. Some directors seem to be "hard to get along with," lacking in personal warmth, friendliness, and adaptability. The director is sometimes accused of failure to show "results."

In each case the director could probably make good a very plausible defense. His interest is in persons rather than in mechanics, but he feels that his first big contribution is not in the field of personal relationships, a field in which the pastor usually and quite properly excels. Rather, the introduction of better organization and system into the school will in the end enable him to render a far larger personal contribution by making more efficient both his own contacts and the whole work of the school. It is difficult to get either a pastor or his congregation, however, to appreciate the director's method of making this contribution. Many a director has doubtless excelled in theory far more than practical leadership ability also.

The only kind of "results" which the average church has ever been taught to appreciate in church-school work are increased attendance and a rather shallow type of enthusiasm. "We've had this high-salaried director here for six weeks, and I can't see that our Sunday school is much bigger than it was before," said one church officer to another. The director, interested as he properly is in improving the quality of work being done, rather than merely boosting attendance, has as one of his most difficult educational tasks the education of the church membership as a whole to recognize and appreciate the real results which he is after.

But, explain the director's difficulties as we may, it must be admitted that a considerable personnel was attracted to the new profession of a type who found great difficulty in adjusting themselves to the practical working situation in the local church. The training which they received gave altogether inadequate attention to the matter of personal relationships and appreciations and too much attention to matters of professional consciousness and rank.

It is certain also that the emphasis upon the mechanics of organization, records, statistics, curricular materials, and the pattern of the public school, somewhat overshadowed attention to spiritual values, human relationships, and tactful leadership, in the early courses on religious education in the college and seminary curriculum.

As a result in part of personnel and in part of training, therefore, there have been an unfortunately large number of casualties in the new profession for which the profession itself must accept chief responsibility. More publicity has been attached to these situations than to the many in which all has gone well. The result is that a considerable number of ministers and churches question the new profession as such, wondering if, after all, it isn't a passing fad which will soon allow the church to settle back into the regular time-honored program.

But there are cases in which responsibility for the "failure" of a director or of his program rests squarely upon the minister. Usually, the minister will have been the moving spirit in creating a sense of need for a director and in bringing about his employment. The minister has been by his entire training and experience accustomed to work alone or at least with no professional colleagues sharing in the leadership of his church. That he would become something of an individualist is inevitable. Many times the stronger his leadership and the more effective his program the more is this individualism accentuated. As long as he carries the whole load of professional leadership, this quality tempered by Christian humility is a real asset.

But with the employment of a professional colleague the situation is changed. Unless the director is qualified, in certain aspects of the church program, to be more of an authority than the minister, then there is little reason for having employed an educational specialist. If the minister is himself qualified to give educational supervision, a director is superfluous. If the director is not qualified, he is equally superfluous.

In case a minister is technically trained and experienced so as to give his church adequate educational leadership, then what he needs is one or more assistants to do his bidding in the less exacting functions and thereby lighten his load sufficiently to make full educational supervision possible.

In other words, a director is needed and justified in situations where the minister is not qualified to give educational aspects of the church program the supervision and direction which they need. When a director is called under these circumstances, certainly within his own field, his special ability and function, as well as his full responsibility, should be recognized. The minister must accept him as a colaborer, not the ranking head of the church, but nevertheless *the* authority in educational aspects of the church's program. This is a hard blow to the individualism which is quite proper when the minister is the only professional authority in all phases of the church program. The seeming inability of the minister to give the director freedom and whole-hearted support under these circumstances accounts for many a casualty.

"But," someone objects, "are there not cases in which the minister, himself qualified to give educational direction, needs assistance, or must unload some of his work? In such cases why not call a director to do most of the work in religious education, but to do it under the direction of the pastor? In other words, he is called merely to relieve the pastor of work rather than to do a piece of work for which the pastor lacks qualifications." To which the answer is: "This pastor needs and wants an assistant, not an educational director. It would be foolish to have two educational specialists on the same staff. It would waste talent, all too rare, and create difficulties of adjustment." A pastor who needs and wants an assistant pastor should secure one, but certainly he neither increases the assistant's usefulness nor honors the profession by calling him a "director of religious education." Well-trained men have suffered disappointment and embarrassment in responding to a call for a "director of religious education" only to find that they were really employed as assistant pastors.

There are other instances still more distressing in their outcomes. Not infrequently a director is called with the full support and co-operation of the pastor. He is given opportunity to be a real director, fully responsible for certain aspects of the church's total program. His leadership proves effective. The church school grows. Parents become enthusiastic about the quality of work being done and the observable results. The community gets its eyes opened upon a new and fascinating type of church program. The consciousness of the congregation and the life of the church increasingly center in the church school. Warm commendation comes to the director. He appears to be a great success.

Where is the minister in all this? Always before he has been at the center. Now he seems to be pushed to the fringe. He becomes an onlooker in his own church. Ministerial nature cannot long bear this. When the crash comes it is usually the director who goes. The next man employed is strictly an assistant pastor even though he may bear the dignity of a professional name.

While many of the difficulties faced by the director of religious education grow out of personal limitations, either on his own part or on the part of the pastor with whom he must work, there are a number of problems inherent in the profession itself, or in the situation into which the director comes.

The profession is new and necessarily on trial. A minister may go on year after year with his church barely "holding its own." Achievements will be noted and failures forgotten. A comparison of the church of to-day with five years ago or ten years ago may even show a net loss. In hundreds of churches such would be the case. Yet this would cause no one to suggest that the plan of having an employed minister be abandoned.

With the director the reverse is true. Many church members are skeptical about the new profession. Tangible net gains expressed in quantitative terms must be continually displayed to justify continuing the experiment. Cases of marked success will be credited to unusually strong individual ability rather than to the profession as such. The least apparent backset will call the whole profession into question. The "burden of proof" to justify his existence to untrained minds is one of the director's heaviest loads, a load which the minister entirely escapes.

The scope of the director's functions is yet very hazy in the minds of most church leaders, and not always clear in the director's own mind. Some so-called directors are merely employed Sunday-school superintendents. Others are pastoral helpers, church secretaries, or young people's workers. Seldom is the director conceived of as the spiritual engineer who co-ordinates all the learning processes of the congregation, seeking to improve their quality and effectiveness.

Most churches are still adult-centered in their point of view and standards of success. The minister gives most of his attention to a program for adults. His work and achievements come continually to their notice. The director centers his major efforts in the needs of childhood and youth. The "substantial" church members who are too preoccupied to give much attention to anything but the "regular church services" may very sincerely ask what he does with all his time, and what good he is doing anyway. Not many families would put the bulk of the budget year after year into providing for the desires and needs of the adult members while the children shift for themselves. Every church does just that which does not provide a ministry for its childhood and youth with the same care and cost as its ministry for adults. In fact, Jesus set "the child in the midst." If one or the other is to be sacrificed the Christian home places the needs of children first. Why should not the church? Yet it is not easy for the adult church membership to appreciate the necessity for large investments in religious leadership for childhood and youth.

The director is not primarily a "platform man." He is the supervisor of teaching, the organizer of the school, and the administrator of a program, the more public features of which are presided over by others. Most of his contacts are personal rather than public. He works largely behind the scenes. The more effective his guiding hand becomes the less it will be noticed. The spiritual engineer who must be ever in the foreground tinkering with the machinery and noisily throwing the levers substitutes display for skill and efficiency.

A complicated piece of machinery in a great factory had gotten out of adjustment and was working badly. A skilled engineer was called from a distant city. He made a minute examination, touched a set screw or two and gave a few taps with a small hammer. The power was turned on and the machine worked perfectly. He sent back a bill for three hundred dollars. The factory owners protested at such an exorbitant charge for "just making a few taps with a little hammer." A new bill was rendered as follows:

Tapping with hammer	$ 2.00
Knowing where to tap	298.00
Total	$300.00

The "tapping" is sometimes all that those who pay the bill can see and appreciate.

Other problems grow out of situations inherent in the motives sometimes prompting the call of a director. Rivalry among large churches in a given city is often actually sharper than their leaders would like to admit. "Keeping up with the Joneses" is responsible for the calling of some directors. In other cases the director is something of a fad. The modern, up-to-date church has one, so we must get one. Sometimes the director is the hobby of one rich man. In other cases a beloved and venerable minister is no longer able to swing the program with his former energy and success. Yet he is too strongly intrenched in the life and affections of the church and community to be retired. Perhaps the employment of a director will bolster up the program and save the embarrassing situation. Again, an ambitious building program may have resulted in an equipment all out of proportion to the traditional anæmic program. The only way to justify the expensive building is to secure a director who will in some mysterious way immediately fill it with teeming activities. The budget is sometimes heavily strained by the director's salary alone and no further provision has been made for much-needed equipment and supplies. Success, of course, demands an expanding budget.

The calling of a director may be prompted by the desire of overburdened volunteer workers to unload. Unless the same volume of volunteer service is still available after the director takes up his work as before, his coming may simply mean that the church is now hiring service formerly rendered out of consecrated leisure time. This is hazardous to the spiritual life of the church and, of course, can mean little net expansion in the program.

On the other hand, voluntary workers may be loath to readjust their own status to make way for the director. One volunteer and utterly untrained superintendent expected the director to work under him as an employed assistant. Again, perhaps only the Sunday-school workers have been consulted and considered in the calling of a director. When he begins to co-ordinate the entire educational program, certain agencies resent his encroachments and impugn his motives.

If the director has been employed as a fad, or luxury, or hired substitute for volunteer service, or as a general handy man, the first period of financial stress is sure to raise the questions, "What has he done? Is he really earning his salary? Wouldn't this be the easiest place to cut expenses?" Unless the director can pull some spectacular stunts at that critical juncture, off goes his head.

But all the foregoing difficulties will be overcome in time as the profession becomes standardized in functions and qualifications, and as continued success demonstrates that it has a real place in the church program. The educational process itself as it operates throughout the congregation will gradually enlist intelligent support and co-operation.

The most baffling problem arising out of dual professional leadership for the church is the difficulty of developing a unified program. We have already noted the importance of recognizing the director's leadership and responsibility in the particular field of work for which he has been qualified and called. It is common to suggest a solution of the problem of the relationship between pastor and director by a clear delimitation of the field and functions of each. If the two can agree on the line of demarcation and each keep within his own field, the problem of functions and relationships is solved.

The difficulty with this solution is that it is invoked for the adjustment of personal relationships rather than for the sake of the best possible program. The spiritual life and needs of the individual and the group cannot be compartmentalized and cared for by dual programs under separate leadership, without sacrificing much of the value of cumulative experience and continuous relationships. There are highly essential "pastoral" aspects and needs in the "educational" program. Certainly, the "regular church services" and "pastoral work" have indispensable educational values and objectives. There is no legitimate line of demarcation between a "pastoral" ministry and an "educational" ministry if each is what it should be. The pastor must be pastor of his church school as much as of his church, or dangerous dissipation of loyalties and separation of agencies will defeat the development of any wholesome church consciousness. The director must be concerned with the educational soundness of the worship, preaching, evangelism, and pastoral oversight to which the entire congregation is exposed, or disastrous cross purposes will result. A program element in a morning church service or an evangelistic meeting which violates sound religious educational principles does just as much damage as though it had occurred in the Sunday church school. There is no such thing as an adequate pastoral oversight which leaves out of account a given age group or agency. There is no such thing as an adequate educational supervision which is not coextensive with the total church program.

But we have already insisted that the only justification for the calling of an educational specialist is to make him responsible for certain aspects of the program and to recognize him as an authority in his own field. We seem now to be saying that there is no such field in which his leadership can be recognized.

If dual leadership means dual programs, then the new profession does indeed render disservice. It but widens an already painful breach in the church's life and program. There must not be two programs, however leadership responsibility may be divided. The goal of a single comprehensive unified program for all ages and interests, properly graded and adapted, but unified and cumulative throughout, is the proper goal of every church. Let there be one program—the program of the church. Let there be one organization—the church.

This one church program will be planned, developed, and put into execution by both director and pastor working in closest co-operation and harmony. Only as the "we" spirit replaces any tendency toward a "mine-and-thine" spirit can true spiritual progress be made and Christlike leadership be given. Pastor and director together develop one program and execute one program, actual executive responsibility being divided for efficiency, but never for the identification of one with one agency or group and the other with another.

Where, then, does the religious educator's special field of authority come into play? In what ways is the pastor given recognition in definite aspects of the program? Just here. The educator will see that the total church program in all its phases is educationally sound throughout and that the best educational methods and materials are everywhere available for the accomplishment of its objectives. In the execution of that program he will take responsibility at points where educational values are especially at stake and where the newer educational methods are being most thoroughly applied.

The pastor, with his larger view of the total church enterprise, will see to it that the program throughout provides adequate and helpful pastoral oversight and sufficient "experience of churchmanship" so that the church both of the present and future is given full opportunity for growth and strength.

Both working on one total program with one total constituency, one pouring in all the resources of the rich pastoral tradition and experience and training, the other pouring in the rich resources of modern educational method, together they are assured that their congregation is enjoying the advantages of "things both new and old" in the development of a richer individual life, church life, and community service. Quite frankly this presents an ideal, perhaps a rather difficult one. But this is written to raise the whole question as to whether we need a new profession of church leadership on any lower level.

It is quite obvious that the ideal calls for a rare matching of personalities. If the pastor is to have sufficient confidence in the educational standing and authority of his director to subject every aspect of the program to his educational evaluation, even including the preaching and evangelistic phases of the program; if the director with all his training is to have sufficient confidence in the pastoral judgment and oversight and the fine churchcraft of his pastor to subject every aspect of the program to his pastoral evaluation, these two men will need to love each other. Unless these two "team" no agreement as to division of authority or function or responsibility can solve the problem of relationships. In the employment of a dual ministry the problem is largely a personal one. Will teamwork be easy, natural, inevitable? Problems of prerogative, professional standing, rank, and function melt away before the warm inclination on the part of both to develop one program for the sake of growing life, "each counting the other better than himself." In the absence of this spirit on the part of either or both, the relationship might about as well be dissolved.

We are in a position now to appreciate the great advantage of the pastor who is in a church sufficiently small so that, with proper assistance, he can direct his total program, being his own educational director; an advantage, of course, conditional upon his qualifications to direct and supervise a modern church school. He escapes the dangers of a dual program, of competing organizations, of conflicting loyalties, and of pastorless children and young people. He gains a new and highly effective approach to all his professional duties, and organizes about himself a great staff of voluntary teachers and workers through whom his own personality is projected and multiplied many times over.

A slowly increasing number of large or wealthy churches will be able to employ a dual ministry or a minister and several educational specialists for various phases of the educational program. Always there will be the necessity of carefully matching personalities and of preventing split-off segments of program from developing around particular leaders. Unity can be achieved, however, and the director of religious education will properly be looked upon as quite essential to the staff of the larger church.

Smaller churches unable to employ or to justify the employment of directors of religious education, and whose pastors are unable to undertake this responsibility, will in increasing numbers find educational supervision by co-operating with other churches in the employment of a district or community director. When this is done, the ministers must take a responsible and intelligent part in setting up and executing the plans of such a director in order to make possible a unity of purpose and activity in each church. This plan needs vigorous extension in spite of the problems of relationship involved.

But with all the excellent service which the specialist is rendering and will continue to render, the only way in which the vast majority of churches will have satisfactory educational supervision will be through their one employed professional leader —the pastor. The sooner we recognize the indispensable place of the pastor in the modern religious educational program, the sooner will the program itself be taken seriously by the church, and receive the backing of all its resources. The sooner also will the modern minister discover the means and methods of restoring the ministry to its proper place of influence and service in the life of the church and community. In the long run the vast majority of churches will have an educational program as good or as bad as their ministers will to have it. The sooner, therefore, this great majority of the churches and pastors cease to look forward to a hypothetical director sometime in the future as the solution to their educational problems, the sooner will an adequate program begin to develop out of present and available resources of leadership. It makes little difference to ninety or ninety-five per cent of the churches in the country whether the director solves the problem or not. Their own solution will be found through a new interpretation of the pastorate.

It is now apparent, therefore, that in the early years of the modern religious educational renaissance a fundamental error was made. In the process of developing religious education from a popular lay function into a process under at least technically trained supervision, the assumption was made that this called for a director in every church. It now appears that it called, rather, for a new and larger definition of the pastor's functions and for a corresponding enrichment of his training, since the other assumption is totally impractical.

This opportunity of leading the total program of a local church using sound educational methods throughout, and using the prestige and unique opportunity of the pulpit in promoting and executing them, is a most alluring calling, even though the church be small or of medium size. It has many advantages over a pastorate in a large church in which one man can keep contact with only sections of the program. It, indeed, offers a new and attractive call to the ministry as a larger profession than ever before interpreted. But let it be clearly understood also that it calls for a new type of minister trained for many difficult functions at which the average minister of to-day would be as great a novice as would the average layman in the pulpit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bower, W. C., *Religious Education in the Modern Church*, Saint Louis: Bethany Press, Chapter III.

Munro, Harry C., *The Church as a School*, Saint Louis: Bethany Press, Chapters VII, XII.

Munro, Harry C., *The Director of Religious Education*, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

CHAPTER VIII

CAN THE MINISTER TAKE ON ANOTHER TASK?

Never before was the task of the minister more difficult and exacting than it is to-day. Time was when community life largely revolved around him. He was the most highly educated person, had the best, perhaps the only library of consequence, was one of few readers of regular periodicals, and was a powerful, if, indeed, not the dominant factor in shaping public opinion and leading community activities. He was *the* person of the locality, as indicated by his colloquial title, "parson." While perhaps this ideal was reached but rarely, it was the minister's accepted position if he was strong enough personally to achieve it.

Many factors have had a part in crowding the pastor from the center of community life and community consciousness. Religious leadership is divided among several ministers in most cases, for communities have become heterogeneous religiously, necessitating the establishment of a number of different churches on a basis sometimes approaching the competitive. Higher education is far more general and the minister seldom has the advantage educationally over a number of other persons in his church. Cultural advantages are now so universally available that the minister has to read and study incessantly to maintain any lead over many of his congregation. Community activities and enterprises are so multiplied and varied that he can scarcely hope to keep in touch with all of them. Instead of being at the center with community and church life revolving around him, many a minister finds himself uneasily struggling to maintain a place in the fringe of these activities, fearing that he will be thrown off entirely by their centrifugal force.

In order to maintain rich contacts which used to be inevitable in a church-centered community life the minister now feels that he must take an active part in luncheon clubs, fraternal orders, and recreational agencies. Incessantly he must be ringing doorbells and exchanging small talk. Contact with business and professional men will involve at least some respectable loafing about their offices or places of business. He must always be ready to chat pleasantly in his study, on the street, or anywhere for as long a time as the other fellow wishes to spend. Few people who have not tried it realize how difficult it is for a minister to budget his time and maintain a schedule of activities as any other professional man does.

The modern church has become a complex organization or group of organizations involving a multitude of committees, group meetings, and personal consultations. The minister can ill afford to lose contact with this machinery even though his soul rebels at the weight of it. A vigorous "through-the-week" program must be maintained if the church is to be a vital and controlling factor in the community. While pastor and people alike will sometimes groan under the burden of such a rich program, the church which is not aggressive and alert at this point is likely to find itself pushed farther and farther to the fringe of consciousness and influence in the life of its membership.

With every decade effective preaching becomes increasingly difficult and exacting. When the sermon was the chief intellectual as well as religious feast of the week, it is not surprising that people endured sermons two or three hours in length. Most ministers of to-day are brought under such pressure to shorten the whole church service, and particularly the sermon, that it is difficult to develop adequately any worthy theme in the few minutes allowed. The ideal of a true pulpit ministry is difficult to maintain in the face of a congregation many of whom are restless to return to their Sunday papers or radios, or to be off on the afternoon auto tour.

If the amount of preaching to which people are willing to listen has decreased, the standards governing its quality have correspondingly been raised. Some of the most able preachers of the country can be heard weekly over the radio in the comfort of one's own living room and with no obligation for financial support, for regular attendance, or even for hearing them through to the end of the discourse if it should prove less interesting than other things "on the air." While we glory in the wider hearing which is thus given to great preaching, certainly the pulpit ministry of the local pastor is rendered the more exacting.

The popular magazine and that literary monstrosity known as the Sunday paper are alluring alternatives to church attendance in many a home. While not as definitely religious as the broadcast church service, they do carry interesting religious features which may help to salve the consciences of recreant church members. The church service, and particularly the sermon, which can meet this competition must be interesting and attractive to say the least.

The attempt to base regular church attendance upon duty does not get very far with most moderns, for the authoritarian concept of religion has greatly weakened. The minister must win a hearing by the attractive power of his personality and message rather than by the pressure of religious obligations.

The great increase in general education, the widespread habit of newspaper and magazine reading, and the educational service rendered by the radio, set higher and more exacting standards for the pulpit. It is a herculean task to keep abreast of what a congregation is reading and hearing so as to keep their intellectual respect. To go beyond them and be able to guide and interpret their thinking upon the background of this omnivorous reading and broadcasting seems almost to attempt the impossible. Yet the minister must keep at least abreast of his congregation's thinking on matters of general and public interest.

In the light of this total situation it is not surprising that the average minister who faces up seriously to his whole task is conscious of being tremendously overworked. He realizes how serious this is, for it means that frequently he is not at his best. He carries to-day, as always, vicariously a multitude of burdens and worries and heartaches which sap nervous energy and tax every reserve of endurance. Other professions which come close to human problems and troubles cultivate a professional attitude which detaches the emotions and sentiments from the routine of daily duties and relieves much of this emotional and spiritual tension. Not so the pastor. The moment his professional attitude begins to dehumanize his contacts, he ceases to serve the need for which he alone is sufficient. With these burdens upon him, it is clear he must husband time and energy most jealously if his largest usefulness is to be preserved.

Facing this situation, it is not surprising that perhaps a majority of ministers have seen the impossibility of doing adequately everything which might properly be expected of them. The Sunday school, traditionally under lay leadership anyway, has seemed to be one responsibility which might be left largely to others. Usually, it has been possible to find an alert and aggressive layman willing to assume the major responsibility for it, relieving the pastor of this great section of the church's work. Logical as this division of labor seemed, we have already noted some of its serious consequences, as well as the difficulties so prevalent in looking toward a professional employed leadership specifically for religious education.

Obviously, however, the minister can face up to this as his responsibility only through a re-definition of his functions and duties, both in his own mind and that of his congregation.

It is probable that such a study of the aims and objectives of the total church program as has already been suggested would serve greatly to clarify this whole matter and lead to such a re-definition of the minister's task. What is needed is something comparable to the "job analysis" studies which help so much to place industry on an efficient basis. It might be difficult to justify many of the activities which take the time and energy of the pastor if every one were to be tested by its direct bearing upon the specific aims of the church program.

Should every invitation to address a luncheon club or be a committee chairman in a civic enterprise be accepted as too valuable an opportunity for "contacts" to turn down? Should the pastor call systematically upon the constituency of his church in a routine fashion, or should his calls be more like those of the family physician, restricted to a specific need and purpose? If the latter, of course a means must be devised for getting the information that a pastoral call is needed and the reason therefor. Should the minister preach two sermons a Sunday or should his best energies be concentrated upon one? Might the problematic evening service be used for the most part as an opportunity for public presentation of various aspects of the total educational program through exhibits, pageantry, and dramatics, and various demonstrations or projects?

Difficult as it is for the pastor to budget his time and follow a working schedule, many ministers are finding it not only possible within limits, but quite necessary. No one would employ a lawyer, a physician, or a plumber for professional services and then connive to fritter away his time with nonessential chatter. If the minister were so determined, most congregations could be trained to co-operate with the pastor in saving his own time and in making a more efficient use of it. If a minister were to take his working schedule seriously, his congregation would soon begin to do so. Increased efficiency would eliminate some fruitless activities and make a place for new undertakings.

The effective leader does nothing himself that he can inspire others to do in a satisfactory manner. Upon this principle the skillful pastor could gradually shift to others many of the minor tasks which consume his time and effort. The plan of organizing the whole parish into "neighborhoods" or "circles" of a dozen or fifteen families each, multiplies the effectiveness of pastoral work. In each neighborhood one dependable person is responsible for monthly reports about each family. Much of the calling is done by these "chief neighbors" or "circle leaders." The pastor is promptly notified of a needed call in any home and of the reason for it. This multiplies the total amount of calling done, but reduces that done by the pastor, and gives every one of his calls a very definite purpose.

It is said in tribute to some ministers: "He is so willing to do anything no matter how common it is. He takes right hold and helps even if it's janitor work." While evidence of a fine spirit of service, this is a doubtful tribute. For a minister to become a "chore boy" or general handy man for the church, is to make such service rather expensive. Employed help or voluntary service might be secured for such tasks at much less expense to the church. Here, again, we see the need of a clear definition of functions and aims.

The supervision of a modern church-school program is more technical and exacting in its requirements than a great many of the activities of the traditional ministry. The only professional and technically trained leadership which the majority of churches will ever have is the pastor. It would seem the part of wisdom to assign to volunteer workers or to eliminate entirely sufficient of the less exacting traditional duties of the pastor to enable him to give his leadership to this great enterprise. If some of the calling, committee work, and community contacts could be shifted to well-organized and directed lay workers, it would likely be better for the workers and not mean much sacrifice in the quality of these functions. This would make possible a more effective use of the technical skill and leadership of the pastor.

A modern religious educational program under the supervision of the pastor will lighten many of his traditional duties. It will place relatively much greater emphasis on public worship, decreasing the load carried by the sermon. Preaching dare not be of lower quality, but the minister need not chafe under the time limitations, for he realizes that this is only one of the many ways in which his purposes are being accomplished in the life of his congregation. The brief sermon will not have to be a complete unit within itself, for it will fit into the larger program of worship, study, and fellowship, through the whole of which the minister is projecting his personality and realizing his aims.

As has already been suggested, pageantry, projects of service, study, and demonstration, and other features growing definitely out of the total educational program will take the place of some of the preaching, being even more effective because more soundly educational in their effect upon the lives of the participants and the audience. In fact, the value of two sermons a day is already much under question. The pastor-supervisor could plan many of his finest Sunday-evening programs as a definite aspect of the church-school work.

An effective method of reducing the number of sermons for which the pastor must prepare, and at the same time making those which he preaches of much greater educational value and spiritual fruitfulness, is to make the evening church hour a definite continuation, of a less formal type, of the morning service. In place of a separate sermon the pastor will have raised in his morning sermon several problems to challenge the thinking of his congregation. They should be practical and life-centered, preferably being definitely related to the total aims and program of the church. At the evening sermon time he would merely restate briefly these issues and invite questions and discussion. His hearers would feel free to challenge any statement which he had made, to re-enforce it from their own observation or experience, or to ask for further light.

Obviously, not all sermons could be so treated. Once or twice a month, however, such an educational use, in the evening, of the morning sermon, would be highly stimulating and interesting, provided, of course, the morning sermon were worth being so treated. Important aspects of the congregation's program or policies, vital community questions, and public issues could be so developed. The skillful expository preacher could also use this method for most effective Bible teaching.

Some of the illustrations given in Chapter III indicate educational substitutes for the Sunday-evening sermon which are proving effective.

Another worth-while use of Sunday evening is to make it an occasion for an adult church school, offering a number of elective courses under various discussion leaders.[1]

Much of the pastor's routine calling is done in the interests of keeping a regular attendance at services and in recruitment of membership. An effective church-school program would be a greater factor in promoting regular church attendance and in recruiting church membership than any amount of calling, provided, of course, it were all unified under the pastor's direction.

The best prospects for church membership are those whose children are already enrolled in the church school. A vigorous and effective educational program attracting new children and youth continually opens up many homes to the most favorable and strategic approach. Pastor and teachers working together to strengthen these bonds between the church school and the homes of its members will accomplish an amount of effective pastoral work very difficult indeed apart from the approach through church-school constituency. Here, again, the pastor's educational responsibility becomes an asset rather than an increased burden in his total ministry.

The pastor's basic method of supervision of his church school will be through the training of a leadership. Ideally, the pastor himself should do much of this training work. This will bring him into very effective contact with the best personalities of his congregation. As he succeeds in bringing them to his own appreciation of their high function and inspires them with his own enthusiasm and educational ideals, each will become in some measure an embodiment of his own spiritual leadership. Through them his own personality will be multiplied manifold, and projected into every classroom and every program. The busier the pastor, the more he is in need thus of multiplying his personality and influence through the lives of a limited group of trained leaders. It was the method of Jesus. It may well become the method of his ministers of to-day. No amount of possible activity on his part personally can so multiply the pastor's power for good as this projection of his purpose and ideals through the multiplied lives of trained leaders.

---

[1] A fine experiment was made in the autumn of 1929 in the Westminster Congregational Church, Spokane, Washington, Dr. Joel Harper, pastor.

It appears that proper redefinition of the pastor's duties and functions—a new "job analysis"—will make it not only possible but expedient for the overworked pastor to become the supervisor of his church school. But the case can be made even stronger. Granted that the pastor might discover and enlist other leadership for his educational program, leaving him free to continue in the rôle of the traditional minister, dare he do so? Can he afford to allow the leadership and supervision of this basic aspect of his church program to fall into other hands?

We have already seen how important it is that strong ties of loyalty and fellowship be developed between the minister and the youth of his church. If that youth is largely identified with one set of agencies and programs and the minister with another, it is next to impossible for him to establish and maintain that essential relationship.

We have seen also how necessary to the experience of churchmanship on the part of growing Christians is a unified and church-centered program. It is exceedingly difficult to achieve such unity under dual leadership. Granted the closest co-operation on the part of a Sunday-school superintendent, unless the pastor is recognized as the responsible supervisor of the educational program he is likely to consume much energy in seeking co-ordination, only then to realize a rather patched pattern.

In a case where the pastor is the one employed leader of the church, he is under unquestionable obligation to serve as well as possible the needs of his total constituency regardless of age. If he were to neglect his adult constituency in order to give most of his time to children and young people, it is likely that complaints would soon be registered against such discrimination. Childhood, of course, is largely silent when the discrimination is reversed, although youth occasionally does protest, as indicated in Chapter III. Conscious of his responsibility to a total constituency, however, it would seem that the pastor would be most sensitive of all to the commission "Feed my lambs," when there is little likelihood of the younger members of the flock raising any voice in their own behalf. A patronizing "children's sermon" as part of the regular church service is no adequate recognition of the pastor's responsibility to this part of his congregation. Only as he personally sees to it that the total educational program is of high quality, meeting their needs on the level of their own interests and experiences, is the pastor living up to that commission.

Whoever leads and supervises the educational program of the church obviously has the dominant influence in determining the church of the future. If the slogan, "What you would put into the state, first put into the school," is sound statecraft, then it is equally sound churchcraft to say, "What you would put into the church, first put into the church school." It is a shortsighted pastor who is willing to leave to others this strategic privilege. The minister, therefore, who is not a mere timeserver, but seeks to lay the foundations for the church of the future, will be deeply concerned with the quality and adequacy of his church-school program.

When the pastoral functions are redefined to include responsibility for the total educational program, the question naturally arises as to what becomes of the traditional Sunday-school superintendent. This depends somewhat, of course, upon who he is and what personal qualities he has. Certainly, his leadership ability and energies must not be lost. Rather, a still more effective channel should be discovered for them. In most cases it would likely be advisable to continue him as superintendent with his duties defined as administrative only. Indeed, no change is involved here, since the superintendent has never been more than an administrator anyway. He should still be responsible for smooth-running machinery in the

Sunday program, seeing that leaders are in place and the sessions get under way properly.

The term "supervision" has usually been used for the function which the minister should fulfill. A more detailed analysis of this function must be reserved for a later chapter.

The relationship between the two functions ought not to be difficult of clear definition. The superintendent is responsible for creating and maintaining the learning-teaching situation, for the mechanics of the school. The pastor-counselor or supervisor is responsible for the *quality* of the learning-teaching process which is under way. He is necessarily concerned with the administrative mechanics so far as they condition the quality of the work. He looks to the superintendent to set up and maintain the situation required according to the specifications of the program as he defines them. Being the professional technician, the pastor-counselor is obviously the ranking officer. He will make it his concern to see that such relationships maintain, however, as will keep the whole question of rank quite subordinate. The two men must work in closest sympathy and co-ordination.

To become the supervisor or counselor of a church-school staff, assuming responsibility for the quality of its work, is a grave undertaking. Some of the teachers are quite certain to be persons of much experience in Sunday-school work and with a rich background of acquaintance with the age-groups with which they work. To become their counselor and help them to do a better quality of work is to assume that one has training and experience superior to their own. To become a counselor without actual contributions to make would be to become ridiculous.

No greater disaster could occur to the pastor or to the church school in which he undertakes to become pastor-counselor than for him or his church to assume that his general ministerial training and experience qualify him for the task. They do not. Modern religious education is technical and exacting if undertaken in serious fashion. Seminaries have formerly generally made light of the Sunday school, disposing of its whole program and the minister's relationship thereto in one or two lectures out of a three-year course given to the work of the ministry. More recently courses have been added, but seldom do they rank with theology and exegesis in seriousness and thoroughness. The vast majority of ministers, after having sensed their educational responsibility, will need a vigorous course of reading and study before they are qualified even to appreciate what the modern church school is.

In fact, the ordinary lay Sunday-school superintendent is about as well qualified to be the educational counselor of the church as is his pastor. His training bears about as directly upon it, and his experience is likely to be more thorough. The pastor who decides to take over educational responsibility without first having definitely prepared himself for it will be as the blind leading the blind.

Adequate academic training for the work of a church-school counselor would be at least twenty-four to thirty hours of graduate work in religious education upon biblical, psychological, and sociological backgrounds. The ordinary seminary work has, of course, some background value, but constitutes to some extent also a liability. Its stress upon problems of scholarship in biblical and theological fields gives them a distorted emphasis and is likely to detract from the practical, vocational interest and motive.

Few things are more discouraging than the immobility of the ordinary seminary curriculum. For twenty years leaders of thought and the crying needs of the church have been calling for a complete reconstruction both in content and method. The modern church program calls for a different type of professional skill than seminaries are developing, and no professional training school in the world has as easy and natural an opportunity to use the method of apprenticeship, supervised practice, and case work as has the seminary. Yet the lecture method still prevails as though there were not already considerable evidence of the "futility of preaching" even to preachers in the making.

As our belated seminaries discover how the ordinary church program is necessarily shifting in its emphasis, they will begin to prepare men for leadership of this total program, let us hope. Several years ago, when the need for a technically trained leadership of local church schools became apparent, the academic response to that need was in terms of "departments of religious education" in colleges and seminaries. These departments aspired to become full vocational training schools and fostered a professional consciousness for a new profession—that of religious education. The inertia of the regular seminary is largely responsible for this. If, instead of these new departments and schools, and this new profession, we could have had a reconstruction of the regular seminary course to prepare every minister to go out and give to his total church program a much-needed leadership, the seminary, the new profession, the minister, the local church, and the cause of religious education would all have been better off to-day.

Ministers now in training should be as thoroughly grounded in religious education as in any other function. Both theory and supervised practice should be provided as a part of regular ministerial training. Ministers in service whose seminary work has neglected religious education or whose work was taken a few years ago will find summer school short-term courses in several of the well-known graduate schools which will be very effective in putting them in command of recent trends in this rapidly growing and changing field. Systematic, well-directed reading in the wealth of high-grade literature now available in religious education will provide at least an orientation. Denominational religious educational boards or offices will usually supply up-to-date lists of books especially helpful. The bibliographies in this book are, of course, suggestive.

The denominational boards through the International Council of Religious Education have worked out most effective training courses which will guide the minister in his study. He will want to use the courses of the Standard Leadership Curriculum for his own training classes. The courses of the Advanced Curriculum on the senior college and graduate level will interest him for his own self-improvement.

The minister upon his background of seminary work and with his studious habits can soon put himself in a much better position to supervise his church school than any lay worker. Also he will find this reading and study contributing very definitely to his general church work. In fact, once the adjustment in functions is made, the minister will find his preaching, his pastoral work, and his total ministry revolving to a remarkable degree around the educational aspects of the program. He will discover that religious education is not so much a special phase or branch of church work as it is a fundamental method and viewpoint for undertaking the total church program. When this has been achieved, educational leadership will not be just one more task added to the burden of an already overworked servant of the church. It will be an effective and fruitful method of unifying and carrying the minister's responsibility for his whole church.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Artman, J. M., and Jacobs, J. A., "Basic Factors in Program Making for a Local Church," *Religious Education*, December, 1929, pp. 951-61.

Beaven, A. W., *Putting the Church on a Full Time Basis*, New York, 1928, Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc.

CHAPTER IX

THE CHURCH AS A SCHOOL IN CHRISTIAN LIVING

THE church has been conceived in many patterns by different generations and among different groups. It has been interpreted as an "ark of salvation" in which membership meant being saved from the general wreckage of this world when the end came, either to the world or to the earthly life of the individual. In the "scheme of redemption" it has been conceived as the authorized agency through which was mediated the forgiveness of God made available in the vicarious sacrifice of his Son. This gave the officers of the church much authority over the destinies of individuals, since they sat in judgment upon the validity of each person's right to membership. Little wonder this gave the church itself tremendous prestige.

The church has been identified with the kingdom of God, and this kingdom conceived in terms of an actual government enforced by officials and physical power. The church thus becomes an empire, not only spiritual, but temporal also if the theory can be put into practice in spite of the opposition of other temporal governments.

Again the church is interpreted in military terms as the army of the Lord "marching as to war." Its function is conceived as a fight against the forces of evil and much Old Testament imagery is used to build up morale and fighting spirit.

To think of the church as a school—a school in Christian living—is not to deny whatever truth there may be in these and other conceptions. Indeed, the church is designed to save, to govern, and to mobilize, but the method by which it will carry out these functions may vary from time to time in the interests of greater effectiveness and better adaptation to the type of social order and general mental patterns with which the church must deal. The method exemplified by Jesus himself ought to create no difficulties. Certainly, so far as he formed any organization it consisted of a "disciplehood" or informal school. If it be discovered that the church's basic method is teaching—teaching in the dynamic life-centered terms of modern education—then the church becomes a school.

This conception has gained acceptance slowly because other conceptions have been more consistent with current theology. The obtrusive emotional phenomena of conversion have been looked upon as evidence of a work of divine grace through which the character and status of the individual have been miraculously and suddenly transformed. The whole technique of professional evangelism has been based on this assumption and has been calculated to bring this result regardless of the previous state of the individual. While the evangelist has granted the desirability of instruction before and after the conversion experience, this has been considered purely supplementary and as in no important way affecting the real status of the individual. It is quite all right for the church school as a special agency for that purpose to do this supplemental work, but it is of a distinctly lower order than that of the evangelist, who works directly through and with the authority of the church.

The religious educator takes as his model the gradual growth and balanced development attributed by Luke (2. 52) to the boy Jesus, and claims to get a superior product by gradual processes. In fact, religious education aims to make radical conversion to Christianity in the sense of a violent disturbance of the personality not only unnecessary but impossible. It seeks to organize the personality from its earliest experiences around the Christian ideal. But the moment we talk about "educating people into the Kingdom" we meet vigorous opposition from the evangelist, who is certain that we are quite underestimating the process of getting into the Kingdom.

The antagonism between evangelist and educator is due to partial views on both sides. While religious education has assumed the co-operation of divine forces, its vocabulary has lacked any adequate terms to express this divine side of the process, so it has been largely silent regarding it, borrowing its terminology from the public school and the research laboratory rather than from theology. If religious education actually undertakes to develop a better Christian personality product by gradual constructive processes than the evangelist does by cataclysmic reconstructive processes, it will require the co-operation of divine forces. The religious educator can well afford not only to recognize and acknowledge them, but to claim them.

The evangelist, on the other hand, when he speaks disparagingly of education, knows not the meaning of the word he uses, for in its Christian sense it means full personality development and not mere instruction. Furthermore, it takes for granted unevenness in the rate of development, assuming periods of intensity of experience not unlike constructive "conversion." In other words, traditional evangelism puts a part for the whole, while religious education is inclusive but has been somewhat reticent about theological terms.

By conceiving of the church as a school, therefore, we are in no sense reducing its work to mere human instruction, nor are we denying the validity and necessity of experiences of such intensity as to correspond with the "conversion" of evangelistic terminology. We do, however, gain a unified and inclusive conception which enables us to bring into co-operation with the divine the very finest human techniques, instruments, and materials.

But the conception of the church as a school is not as new as it might seem. The Rev. H. M. Parsons, of Boston, speaking before the First International Sunday School Convention held in Baltimore in 1876, said:

> The directions to the church declare that the church is the school of Jesus Christ, the great Teacher, that the object which our Redeemer had when he said, "All power is given unto me, in heaven and in earth"—"therefore," that is the connecting link, because all power is mine, now! to-day!—"therefore, go ye and make disciples [scholars] of all nations." . . . I have very strong convictions on this subject, that the Church of God is the one body commissioned on this earth to do the business that the Master left, and that the Sabbath school is an important and integral part of the church's work; that

the church has no business to let the Sunday school go as a secondary thing.

He then describes in glowing terms the great educational sessions of his congregation in which he had actually converted the church into a school.

The Rev. James A. Worden, speaking before the Second International Sunday School Convention in Atlanta, Georgia, 1878, said:

> The Sabbath school and the church are identical, just as the army on the review and the same army on the march are identical. I would, with diffidence, submit this definition of the Sabbath school for your consideration: *The Sabbath school is the Church of God assembled to teach and to learn, by the help of the Holy Spirit, the Word of Christ.*
>
> . . . *Does the Sabbath school embrace the entire church?* This Atlanta Convention could not render a grander service to Christ's kingdom than to decide this question, and with its voice of gathered love and wisdom, call all the adults of the church into the Bible school. At once this call, if obeyed, would add from three to five millions to our schools. If obeyed, this call would bring the church up to Christ's ideal—that of a school in which Christ is himself the Great Teacher, and every believer a disciple or scholar.

The Rev. C. L. Goodell in the same convention said:

> The Sunday school is the Church of God together studying his Word; it is only another phase of Christ's Church attending to an important part of its great duty. It is not a place for the children alone, for the young men and young women simply, but it is a place for all of God's people to enter into a study of God's Word together.

At the Eleventh International Sunday School Convention in 1905 at Toronto, Bishop J. H. Vincent delivered an address on "A Forward Look for the Sunday School." He proposed the term "church school" as the name to be used in the future and painted a vivid picture of the coming identity of church and school. Another speaker epitomized the bishop's picture thus:

> Did you mark the perspective point of the picture—the point toward which all its lines tended? Was it not this—the whole Church of God, and every particular congregation thereof gathered around the Holy Bible in study, research, and conversation upon the teachings of the Word? The church a Bible school for infants, for children, for youth, for adults, each class in its degree mastering the vital doctrines and ethics of Christianity unto the saving and sanctification of all!

In 1918 the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America appointed a Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook. It was the duty of this committee "to consider the state of religion as revealed or affected by the war, with special reference to the duty and opportunity of the churches."

It is not surprising that this committee set about its work and planned its voluminous reports without very definite reference to the educational work of the church. Nor is it surprising that in the preparation of the report of four large volumes it became increasingly evident that every problem rests back upon the church's educational program. Consequently, two years later a fifth volume was issued on *The Teaching Work of the Church*. In the editorial introduction to this worthy report Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert says:

> The task which the Committee at first set for itself did not include any special discussion of the educational work of the church. At every turn, however, it has proved impossible to avoid it.
>
> The Committee's first study, the inquiry into "Religion among American Men: As Revealed by a Study of Conditions in the Army," based on the testimony of those who had been most intimately in touch with that great cross-section of American young manhood represented by our National Army, revealed beyond the shadow of a doubt that the church, as a teacher, has seriously failed in developing even among its members a clear conception of the meaning of Christianity for human life. When, in "The Missionary Outlook in the Light of the War," the Committee considered the church's missionary responsibility, the chief difficulty was found to be that those who comprise the average membership of the church do not yet really understand the universal character of the Christian gospel and its profound meaning for our international life. To develop the needed consciousness of the unity of mankind and of a world-wide task was seen to require educational processes efficient enough to change the point of view of great masses of men.
>
> No less inevitable was the same conclusion when, in "The Church and Industrial Reconstruction," our present economic and industrial life was examined in the light of the Christian ideal for society. To modify our existing social order—which accepts self-interest as the only motive strong enough to afford a foundation for our industrial life, which takes ruthless competition as the principle of economic organization, which measures success by the accumulation of material wealth and the exercise of power over the lives of others—until we have

a society in which human values have first consideration and every personality has opportunity for full development, in which brotherhood is the fundamental relationship of men, and love the controlling motive, in which service to the common good is the test of all success, this, again, is a prodigious task which can be achieved only by thorough and persistent educational effort.

Even when studying the organization of the church itself, in "Christian Unity: Its Principles and Possibilities," the educational issue was inescapable. Convinced that the churches cannot hope to lead warring nations or conflicting classes into fraternal co-operation unless they themselves, which proclaim the gospel of unity, can embody it in their own relationships to each other, the Committee nevertheless found that this requires the training of church members in their underlying unity of spirit and purpose, and a deepening appreciation of what the unity of the church could mean in achieving the unity of mankind. The more the Committee has considered any of these problems, the more compellingly has it been led to study the educational work of the church. Hence the present volume, appearing two years after the other four reports."[1]

The definite viewpoint of the church as a school is well stated in Chapter II of this report by Dr. Luther A. Weigle:

In a general but vital and fundamental sense the whole life of the Christian Church is an educational enterprise, and its entire work is that of teaching.

This appears in the fact that the church as a whole bears all the typical characteristics of any educational enterprise. The marks of an educational enterprise are: (*a*) that it concerns itself with growing, developing persons; (*b*) that it seeks to engage these persons definitely in some form of study or purposeful activity; (*c*) that its primary interest, in so doing, is the development of the persons themselves, rather than the objective results of their activity; (*d*) that it seeks to communicate to them, while they in turn seek to profit by the riper experience of others; (*e*) that the whole process has its face set toward the future, aiming to promote their development, and to help them gain new knowledge, added power, and richer character; (*f*) that the whole process, again, is socially motived, both in that it implies some sort of fellowship, and in that its goal is the betterment, not merely of individuals, but of human society.

---

[1] Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, *The Teaching Work of the Church*, Association Press, 1923, pp. iii-v. Reprinted by permission.

All of these marks are characteristic of the Christian Church.[2]

The conception of the church as a school is borne out further if we consider the chief aims or functions of the church as indicated in the responsibilities carried by its officers and committees.

Worship would probably be considered the chief function of the church proper. Except for the emphasis on its teaching function, there is no more wholesome and prevalent tendency throughout Protestantism to-day than an increasing emphasis upon worship of a dignified and worthy order. Increasing care is given to music, careful preparation, orderliness, and some degree of ritual and form. Architecture also expresses eloquently the new emphasis.

But many a minister with high ideals of worship has learned to his dismay that it takes more than a vested choir and a printed order of service to produce a real worship experience on the part of his congregation. He longs perhaps in vain for something of that reverence for the Lord's house and that sense of God's presence on the part of his membership which characterize the Episcopal or Roman Catholic worshiper. Which is but to confess that worship is, after all, chiefly a matter of education. Any congregation will be a devoutly worshiping congregation when it has been reared that way. Otherwise, the ideal may be only approximated by using all the helps to worship and earnestly, patiently training the adults whose early training lacked the worship experience.

---

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

In fact, in a church which provides a modern educational program for its childhood and youth, it is not at all unusual to find the youngsters setting a fine example for the "oldsters" in this respect. Young people frequently complain that the church service, and even communion, are marred by older people who lack reverence and appreciation.

In other words, worship is chiefly a matter of education, and any thorough approach to it will be an educational approach. Perhaps it will take a generation to realize the ideal.

Next in order would probably come the evangelistic aim or function of the church. We may as well face the well-known fact that the "fruits" of special evangelistic effort are in large part plucked from the vineyard of church-school teaching and pastoral care. The high mortality of evangelistic results, not so grounded and so conserved, is equally well known. Untrained and untaught persons brought into the church on a wave of evangelistic fervor constitute not a force but a field, even after conversion.

On the other hand, it is the warmth and fervor of the evangelistic objective and ideal which exalts religious education as the transcendent culmination of all true education. Likewise the solid, constructive growth processes of religious education undergird life-commitment with knowledge, habits, skills, and attitudes which give to that commitment its true value and fruitfulness. If the church would realize her evangelistic function, therefore, she will do it best by becoming an effective school in Christian living, in which life-commitment will be one of the expected and desired achievements.

The missionary enterprise properly concerns the church as one of its major objectives. The present difficulties faced by all mission boards in financing their work grow not out of the poverty of the church, but out of wrong earlier methods in missionary promotion. Special offerings, drives, and emotional appeals have constituted a propaganda which was successful but short lived in its effectiveness. The most reliable and prolific source of support is among women in which semi-educational societies have long been laying a solider foundation.

How shall the church carry out its missionary function? Not simply by raising missionary offerings, but, rather, by growing missionary persons. Missionary education so thoroughly integrated with its total program and so saturating its whole spirit that the label will be superfluous will *grow* a generation of Christians who will support the missionary enterprise not as a favor to some mission board, but as a very principle of life. Again we fall back upon the church as a school to realize our aim.

The whole matter of practical service is on the same plane, as is also that of finance. It is not surprising that the Christian doctrine of stewardship is a "hard saying" to an adult Christian whose whole life has been developed and organized around an essentially pagan conception of property. To be sure, there will be "conversions" here and there, but, by and large, adult church membership will hold about the same ideals of property that were learned in youth when little property was possessed.

By what means can the Christian doctrine of stewardship be made to bring to the service of the Kingdom the total material resources of our church membership? By transforming every church into a school of Christian living in which a generation will be reared to go the whole way in Christian stewardship. The practice is easy in the Primary and Junior Departments. It will be easy in an adult group who have grown up in consistent practice of it.

Even such a mundane concern as "house and grounds" is approached adequately only by an educational process. Church property to-day is less dependent on the actual wealth of the congregation than on their attitude toward the Lord's house. Rear a generation properly valuing the church and its physical equipment and there will be little trouble either in securing or caring for adequate church equipment.

Let the church set before herself any worthy and legitimate aim. It will be seen that an educational process is the way to its achievement. Make of the church an effective teaching agency, and the future—any desired future—is assured. If the church's basic method is teaching—teaching in the dynamic, life-centered terms of modern education—then the church becomes inevitably a school.

But certainly the humdrum, material-centered institution which many of us remember does not present a very attractive pattern for the church. A school in the modern sense, however, is a controlled environment, providing experiences through which desired changes are effected in persons—changes in knowledge, yes; but even more important, changes in values, ideals, purposes, habits, attitudes. If it is the purpose of the church to develop persons sufficiently Christlike that they will set about transforming society into the kingdom of God, then this type of person is to be developed through having the necessary Christlike experiences. Such experiences can be provided with assurance only in a controlled environment under a qualified leadership—in a school in Christian living. When the church reconstructs its program and organization to this end, it begins to fulfill its larger mission and to use its most effective method.

These requisite experiences form the church's program. We have seen in an earlier chapter something of what they are. They will include worship on the level of and in terms of the everyday experiences of each age group or distinctive social group. They must provide for the learning and appropriation of the richest bodies of racial religious experience as communicated to us through sacred literature, institutions, and customs. Especially must the ideals and purposes and example of Jesus be made so clear and attractive that they will be eagerly appropriated. This makes it necessary for the growing individual to have membership in a social group where these ideals form the accepted standards of conduct, calling for fellowship and participation in group activities on the Christian level. Experiences of service or helpfulness from genuinely Christian motives must be provided. And such guidance and control must be exerted over leisure-time activities that they will be constructive and helpful rather than detrimental. These experiences of worship, learning, fellowship, service, and recreation constitute the curriculum of the church as a school.

The total student body of this school comprises those of all ages, all degrees of ability and capacity and widely varied experience backgrounds. While a full, well-rounded program will be needed on each age or experience level, there will necessarily be careful adaptation to each group of the experiences made available and the materials used. This calls for a graded program throughout.

Gradation is not to be pushed so far, however, that the individual loses fellowship with and the sense of loyalty to the whole church. The child who never worships with any but a Primary group loses the sense of reality which comes from participation in a larger normal community group. His experience in the group of his own age needs occasional validation and re-enforcement by the presence and example of those who are older. There is somewhere a happy medium between cutting the individual off from participation in the whole community and cutting him off from participation in a group strictly on his own experience level. The richer curriculum includes both and gives equal care that both are conditioned so as to be effective.

Gradation is needed to bring experiences within the capacities of different age groups, but it is needed for another equally important reason not so commonly recognized. Achievement is the measure of any educational process, and the sense of achievement is one of the strongest of all wholesome motives. The organization of the curriculum on ascending levels of experience provides for progressive achievement and its recognition. While some educators decry the extent to which achievement recognition is used to motivate general education to-day, no worthy substitute has been proposed. If credits and degrees were to be abolished, our whole educational system would likely disintegrate. At least not any of the educators who bemoan the evil effects of the credit system have had the courage to abolish it in their own institutions.

Falling into conversation with a stranger one day, I learned that he was ardently interested in the Boy Scout Movement, and also that he was a thirty-third degree Mason. He was also a church member. He confessed, "Do you know, Masonry has meant much more to me than my church ever has, and I can see all sorts of advantages that scouting has over Sunday-school work."

"Would you mind," I asked, "telling me frankly just why you feel that to be the case?"

"Well," said he, "you join the church and that's about all there is to it. But with Masonry, there is always something ahead. You can always work up into a higher order. That makes it interesting and keeps you at it. The same is true in scouting. A boy joins as a tenderfoot. He has certain work to do and tests to pass to become a second-class scout. Then he goes on working to become a first-class scout, then an Eagle scout, and so on. In addition there are all sorts of merits to work for. But a boy goes to Sunday school year in and year out and where has he been and what has he got to show for it?"

The man was wrong. Of course he was. Joining the church isn't "all there is to it," as many a Christian layman can testify. There is growth and achievement and "work" far beyond the scope of any fraternity-order ritual. And many a church school offers youth fully as challenging an achievement program as scouting.

Yet, as he saw it, the man was right. The church has not organized its program in such a way that the progressive steps of achievement are apparent and readily recognized. The whole matter is indefinite and intangible. The Sunday school has not clearly defined for youth the successive achievements in realizing her aims for him, and it is not surprising that he sometimes decides that the whole thing is sort of a vicious circle.

The greatest weakness of our existing church program is that, on the face of it, it assumes a dead level of religious experience beyond conversion, neither taking for granted nor providing for any recognition of continuous growth and spiritual achievement. The experience of becoming a thirty-third degree Mason or a first-class scout may, indeed, be more meaningful than that of becoming an elder in the church or a class president. Why?

Because one requires a series of progressive achievements which can be recognized step by step, while the other has no very definite requirements which can be consciously and progressively met.

The attitude of the traditional church was as though it had conferred upon its converts at the moment they joined it the degree of S. F. D. (saved from damnation), and it provided no graduate courses. The church as a school interprets church membership simply as matriculation in a more advanced grade, and lays out its curriculum accordingly.

Suppose, for example, that a church should develop a rich program of activities of all sorts, rich enough to provide personality-forming experiences for every member. All these activity opportunities would be classified, some for younger, some for older members. Certain ones would be particularly for adults who have just come into the church with perhaps little experience in church life. There would be leadership of various activity groups; acts of service in homes or about the church building; calling, either alone or in company with some older or younger person; committee work; providing flowers and other decorations; ushering; helping with music; work on the bulletin or other publicity; teaching; counseling; personal work; church attendance; participation in worship, church offices, etc. In addition to these church-centered activities there would be, of course, those vastly larger projects involved in introducing Christian ideals and leadership into all home, community and occupational contacts.

A "job analysis" would be made out describing each type of activity and what was expected of each person undertaking it. Each activity would be rated on some sort of point system to give it relative value. Each church member would be expected to engage regularly in activities totalling a minimum number of points. No one would be permitted to load up beyond a certain maximum. Every person could check regularly whether his participation was up to the norm. Pastoral visits and conferences would thereby be provided with a definite basis for something besides "small talk."

Now, suppose an individual, being duly "converted," "matriculates" in this church. The pastor in a personal conference with him goes over the various activities which are open and are appropriate for a new member, helping him to elect those most nearly to his liking and also best adapted to his abilities and his needs. Regular church attendance, of course, is a "required," with its allotted point credit. Ushering, working on a visitation committee with mature members, singing in the choir, and perhaps doing some statistical work on the records to help the pastor are "electives" from among which he may choose. There are certain other responsibilities for which he will be qualified after a year of creditable apprenticeship. If the church program were organized in that tangible form, would anyone say that after he had joined it was all over? But that is a mere hint as to the possibilities of the church organized as a school. Why should not church officers and teachers be chosen from among a group who have earned the distinction and responsibility by a progressive series of well-defined achievements?

The certification of qualified church-school teachers with proper recognition, and the provision of means by which they may qualify themselves are, of course, part of any such plan. In fact, from the ordination of the minister down to the consecration of the humblest church-school officer, why should not all places of responsibility be filled by those who have qualified and whose qualifications are recognized?

The dangers of making such a plan mechanical and wooden are so great that one almost hesitates to suggest any such system. Yet, certainly the average church is getting nowhere with the present lack of definiteness in its achievement program. With fine spiritual perceptions and appreciations and a large endowment of common sense, some pastor is going to revolutionize church management by putting educational principles at work in it.

The church as a school will, like the home and community, center its interests, and make its most careful and thorough provision for those of its number whose needs are greatest and who are most dependent. These provisions will yield largest fruitage when invested in those whose growth is most rapid and whose lives are most responsive, due to immaturity. The task of providing for this expanded, youth-centered program will stimulate adults into many personality enriching activities and transform the whole congregation into a vast learning-teaching enterprise.

A much expanded program for children will, of course, be the result. In addition to a rich schedule of week-day activities which will be related to the Sunday curriculum, the Sunday-morning program itself will be as full and adequate for children and youth as for adults. The church as a school will meet from 9:00 or 9:30 A.M. until noon, each age-group being provided a rich, varied, but unified curriculum. During at least half of this expanded session the minister should be with some group of the children. In fact, he will so arrange the schedule that his contacts will, week in and week out, be about as rich with one group as with another.

The schedules followed in three departments of the First Christian Church School of Oklahoma City, are given herewith to show how the time is used in one case. Churches not observing communion service every Sunday would, of course, make adaptations at that point. These schedules and plans are not given in any sense as models, but merely to make the idea more concrete.

PRIMARY DEPARTMENT

Pupils in grades 1, 2, and 3; 6, 7, and 8 years of age:

9:45–10:05. Worship.
10:05–10:35. Lesson period—in classrooms.
10:35–10:50. Fellowship — recognition of birthdays, greetings, informal period.
10:50–11:10. Recreation—relaxation, and play.
11:10–11:35. Service—in classrooms, making of posters, and handicraft work.
11:35–12:00. In assembly—story period, memory work, review, dramatization.

JUNIOR DEPARTMENT

Pupils in grades 4, 5, and 6; 9, 10, and 11 years of age:

9:45–10:15. Classrooms—recitation of lessons prepared in class the previous Sunday and at home during the week.

10:15–10:45. Worship in departmental auditorium. The Lord's Supper is observed each Sunday. Elders of the church preside and Junior boys, members of the church, serve as deacons in passing the communion and in receiving the offering.

10:45–11:30. Supervised study in classrooms, under direction of teachers. Pupils learn to study and use their Bibles. Part of this study period used in expressional handicraft projects related to lesson material. Different projects used for each grade.

11:30–11:45. In departmental assembly, memory work and departmental instruction. Bible drills and memory of Scripture material, also new hymns memorized.

11:45–12:00. Story or dramatization in auditorium. Occasional stereopticon missionary talks given at this period.

Deacons appointed by Superintendent, organized with a chairman, and serve for two months, when changed.

INTERMEDIATE (JUNIOR HIGH) DEPARTMENT

Pupils in grades 7, 8, and 9; 12, 13, and 14 years of age:

9:45–10:15. Classrooms—recitation of lessons prepared in class the previous Sunday and at home during the week.

10:15–11:00. Worship in departmental auditorium. Pupils conduct the program, reading Scripture and offering prayers, etc. Lord's Supper observed each Sunday. Elders of the church preside and Intermediate Boys, members of the church, serve as deacons in passing the communion and in receiving the offering. Sermonette by the Director of Religious Education.

11:00–11:30. Study in classrooms, supervised by teachers. Part of this period used in expressional handicraft projects related to lesson material. Different projects used for each grade.

11:30–12:00. Assembly in departmental auditorium. This is an expressional period, in that topics are discussed, debates held, dramatizations, and once each month a departmental business meeting is held. Student president presides and committees make formal reports of plans.

In this department the officers serve for six months.

It is highly desirable that this schedule provide for brief periods regularly in which, from middle childhood up at least, the whole congregation have fellowship together in worship in the main sanctuary of the church. Greater care will be put into the choice of materials and the preparation for this service than for any other. It is possible to find and use materials which come within the experience of childhood and have already been mastered, and which are also rich and meaningful for older persons. Only such should be used.

It is worth while to work out a church calendar for the year, making seasonal emphases such as Harvest Time, Thanksgiving, Christmas, Easter, etc., choosing themes for congregational meditation, worship, study, and fellowship running through a period of weeks. These themes could guide departmental group programs to some extent and could come to their climacteric expression in the larger gatherings. The church calendar of the liturgical church has such values as to warrant a thoroughly educational equivalent in the church as a school.

Under the skillful leadership of the Rev. Harold F. Humbert, the church in the small college community of Hiram, Ohio, has developed a rich and well-unified program for all age groups. This is carried out as the program of the "church," the period from 10:30 to 12:30 being used by all simultaneously.

For pre-school children and those of kindergarten age a two hour program of song, prayer, story and play is carried out rather informally.

In the Primary Department, first, second, and third public-school grades, the program begins with a thirty-minute class period for lesson study. This is followed by a twenty-minute worship period, and the last fifty minutes is given to activities of various sorts calculated to give the children first-hand experience in projects of Christian living.

In the Junior Department, school grades four, five, and six, the opening class period is forty minutes in length. This is followed by fifty minutes of instruction and activity on the part of the group as a whole. The closing thirty minutes is given to worship.

The High School Department, including both junior and senior high-school students, gives the whole period from 10:30 to 11:40 to worship and varied activities of Christian learning and living. The worship tends to be very dignified and somewhat formal, differing from the adult worship program chiefly in relating its themes to youthful experience and in the large place occupied in its leadership by the students themselves. From 11:40 to 12:30 this group engages in class work of the usual type.

The college student and adult group combine for a worship and preaching service from 10:30 to 11:40. The closing fifty minutes is given to class teaching.

The fact that this is a small church with limited equipment has justified some combination of adolescent groups which might otherwise be handled more effectively if separate. A distinctive feature of this church's work has been the construction in the basement out of celotex of a small but very beautifully appointed chapel for the worship of the younger groups. Their schedules are so arranged that the chapel is used successively by three groups. The construction, the decoration with carefully selected and arranged pictures, the dedication, and the use of this chapel have apparently had a marked effect on the religious life of these groups.

A less formal and perhaps more vital type of program under way in the Union Avenue Christian Church of Saint Louis, Missouri, is thus described in a personal letter to the writer by Abbott Book, director of religious education, who is largely responsible for it.

> First let me say we are moving in the direction of a graded church, not simply a church school with the expanded session for children of Kindergarten, Primary, Junior, and Intermediate ages. Our boys and girls are growing up with the consciousness that their whole program of worship, instruction, and activity, which begins on Sunday morning and carries over throughout the week, is church. I think within another year or two the term "church school" will disappear entirely from our nomenclature. This has already come to pass with our children and young people.
>
> It would be hard to provide sample programs, as we

no longer follow the stereotyped, superimposed programs in any of our departments. Our Kindergarten work is very informal. The Kindergarten teacher comes before her group with a well-planned program for the morning, but as the children assemble they manifest certain interests growing out of things they have heard or have experienced. This is the beginning point for the teachers. Oftentimes the whole morning's work must be changed. The teachers always try to keep in mind the importance of a unified experience through worship, story, and activity.

The work in the Primary, Junior, and Intermediate Departments is more or less of the informal type. I would say that it is a happy combination of the two. The formal in worship sometimes has its place even with children and early adolescents.

These periods are followed in the Primary: fellowship, at which time the new pupils are introduced and birthdays recognized; class period, at which time the children recall lesson stories of other Sundays and these stories are reinterpreted to them. Then comes the period of instruction in the use of worship materials, then the lesson story of the day is told in the second class period. This is followed by a period of worship. These periods are sometimes shifted as the need may arise.

The Junior and Intermediate Departments have four periods, two departmental and two class. The departmental periods are fellowship and worship. The class periods are supervised study and recitation. The fellowship period also provides opportunity for instruction in the use of worship materials.

Our Juniors and Intermediates assemble with the Young People and Adults at the close of the church hour of worship and all participate in the communion service together. In some of the older types of expanded program the assembly and class periods were superimposed by the adult leaders. The worship service originated with the principals and the few teachers who were willing to co-operate, and the boys and girls were expected to participate pretty much as the adults participate in the average church service. But in our work here our adult leaders work in the background, and the program all the way through is a program of sharing. The most surprising thing to me is that the programs planned by our boys and girls are oftentimes better than the programs handed down by our adults. These programs are interpreted by the boys and girls in the light of their needs and experiences. The instruction does not end with the Sunday session, but our teachers are more and more coming to understand how important it is that they help their pupils live the things they are being taught. This, therefore, involves contacts beyond the Sunday class session.

To give a concrete example: As we were approaching a special offering day for the Christian Orphans' Home a lesson in the Senior Department emphasized the program of missions and benevolences. A request came from a class of boys that we suggest some projects from among which they might choose in order that they might have the privilege of experiencing the thing which this lesson had impressed upon them. The next word which came to me was that this group of boys had challenged the department to adopt an orphan for the Home not as a class project, but as a departmental project. Thus the lesson for this Sunday will carry over fifty-two Sundays in the year. I have never seen our Senior Department in such a fine condition as it is at this time, and we attribute this to the fact that the boys and girls are privileged to experience some things they are being taught, not only in missions and benevolences, but in so far as their daily living is concerned.

Below the Senior Department we are following departmental use of closely graded lessons. The plan was adopted as an experiment more than a year ago, but this is no longer spoken of as an experiment. The changes have been most satisfactory, and now the boys and girls with the help of their adult leaders are sharing in a program of worship, instruction, and activity which is thoroughly unified and which could never have been possible under the old program of having three lessons in a given department.

I am thinking of this only as a statement of the type of program we are actually engaged in at the present time. I hope I have not painted too rosy a picture. It is not working to perfection, and never will, but I can truthfully say that our teachers for the most part are rendering a real service, and there is a spirit of happy intimacy involving pupil and teacher which could never come to pass through a program of religious education handed down by a group of adults.

One of the most continuous and fruitful experiments with the enlarged program which transforms the church into a school in Christian living is that described by Dr. A. W. Beaven in a book[3] which every pastor should possess and study. When the Lake Avenue Baptist Church, of Rochester, of which Doctor Beaven was pastor, was confronted with the opportunity for week-day religious education, a public-school principal, an official in the church, raised the question whether the church was adequately using its available time on Sunday. When the rather thin Sunday-school program was surveyed, it was found to be such an inadequate use of the church's Sunday opportunity that an entirely new Sunday church-school program known as the "Three Period Session Plan" was launched.

---

[3] Beaven, A. W., *Putting the Church on a Full Time Basis*, Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc.

The first period, from 10:30 to 11:15, brings the entire church constituency above the nursery age into the church worship sanctuary, where they sit by families for a forty-five-minute worship period conducted by the pastor. The program is simple but dignified and is built more largely around the needs, interests, and experiences of children than of adults. Special attention is given to helping the children participate in the singing and the responses, and their presence is recognized throughout both in the speech and manner of the pastor. There are certain monthly worship themes, worship elements memorized and used repeatedly, and drill and study features in which all participate, interest centering in the participation of the children.

There is a definite message from the pastor for the children dealing with their own churchmanship, their daily living, and their home situations. Without patronizing them, the children are taken seriously as a legitimate and integral part of the congregation and the program built for them.

This period closes with a recessional in which all the younger grades march in an orderly fashion from the room led by the Junior choir.

The second period finds the older young people and adults still in the church auditorium listening to the sermon while the younger grades have marched into their department rooms for a forty-five-minute period of class work. A definite curriculum of instruction is followed, the purpose being to give each grade about as heavy a course as it can carry. Of course the teaching staff misses the sermon, but they undertake the service with this definite expectation and are willing to pay the price.

There is a ten-minute intermission from 12:00 to 12:10 during which time adjustments are made for the third period.

From 12:10 to 1:00 adults and young people have their study and class session and the younger grades engage in group activities of a freer and more informal type than those of the second period. The course followed is distinctly different from that of the second period and includes notebook work, map work, and other activities.

During this third period ten weeks of each year the pastor meets the entire Junior High School group for a cycle of studies in churchmanship and Christian living, thus inducting them into the church and personally becoming well acquainted with each one.

Seven years of this program developed no insuperable problems and yielded many most satisfactory results. Here was a pastor who enriched his church program into a school in Christian living and himself was able to keep closely in touch with young and old engaged in this vital process.

Obviously, such a program as this could be undertaken only after a long and careful period of preparation and leadership training. Curricular materials are available wherever leaders are, but the requirements of the leadership are much more exacting than in the simpler church-school program.

With such an adequate program as this on Sunday morning, the question arises as to the afternoon or evening meetings. Clearly, additional services should be conducted only if they meet specific needs not otherwise met. In some communities not all can be free at the morning hour and an evening meeting must be provided. In other cases the evening service reaches transients, or young people who otherwise would spend Sunday evening less wholesomely. All such special needs or aims as these will require provision of an evening program.

In many churches, however, it would be possible to develop a general churchwide tendency to use Sunday afternoon and evening for family and home life. If this could be done and the three-hour graded church program were successfully in operation during the morning, this would seem to constitute the ideal schedule for the day. Such a plan would need to be approached gradually and carefully in order to conserve all values of the past.

As the leader of his total educational program, the pastor will be much concerned with other means of expanding and enriching it. The vacation church school and week-day church school are possibilities in this direction.

The vacation church school continues five mornings a week for four to six weeks, providing more teaching time than a year of the ordinary Sunday school. Its continuous and frequent sessions make available an intense and cumulative experience in Christian living impossible through any other agency. Its varied and flexible program and the availability of the entire church building and equipment make possible a high quality of work.

The vacation school is an especially fortunate opportunity for the pastor to direct a vigorous educational enterprise. It comes in the summer when his "regular" work is slack and a minimum of demands will be made on his time. There are few traditions to limit experimentation and a fresh approach in method and organization. Leadership may be selected without embarrassments growing out of positions already held. The freer organization and larger expression of the play spirit create an atmosphere in which it is most wholesome for the pastor to come into intimate fellowship with the children of his parish.

Many ministers have found the week-day church school also an excellent opportunity for supervision, teaching, and fellowship. Well removed from the peak load carried by the minister on Sunday, the week-day school may employ time and energy not available for the Sunday church school.

As these new agencies become available, however, care should be taken that they constitute an actual expansion of the existing program rather than unrelated and perhaps confusing experiences. The interests of a unified program and cumulative experience for each age-group can be conserved only as supervision is exercised by someone who sees the whole task and knows the total resources. The pastor, if qualified, stands in a unique position to do this.

With this view of the rich program possibilities before the church as a school in Christian living, we must now face its implications in the organization of the institution. This entire program needs to be organized, unified, and directed through one governing board.

A step in that direction is the educational committee already responsible for the educational agencies in some churches. But this still contemplates education as a special function carried by certain agencies rather than as the basic method of the total church program.

In working toward a satisfactory organization, however, it would probably be well in most cases to use a strong educational committee as an intermediary step. Ultimately, however, we must look toward a church governing body which will approach every function educationally and which will specify no particular aspect of the total church program as its "educational work." In other words, the general board of officers will interpret all its work as educational and will direct the program accordingly.

The existing official boards in even the best churches would be totally unqualified for such a responsibility. While a small, carefully chosen educational committee carries the responsibility, a vigorous campaign of enlightenment as to the meaning of the new concept "the church as a school" should be carried on from the pulpit and in personal conferences and group meetings. Over a period of years a new board should gradually be developed around the educational committee as its nucleus. The discovery and training of a personnel for this new educationally minded board of the future will be one of the pastor's chief enterprises. As the enriched curriculum of service activities and training which has already been suggested becomes available, these congregational leaders will gradually grow into skillful leadership and educational responsibility. A thorough study of the aims and objectives of an adequate local church program made by the official body will do much to give them a constructive educational viewpoint. All the way along the pulpit will be a powerful instrument of enlightenment, motivation, and open-mindness.

Each pastor will have his own best way to develop the new type of official leadership. A pastor's cabinet including heads of all departments of church work may be the best approach. The church school workers' conference may provide a valuable nucleus. A special training class which undertakes as a project a special intensive and self-critical study[4] of "Our Church" might open the way. The new teaching and official leadership demanded by this new vision of the church's basic function and method must be developed as the very means of effecting the needed transformation in program.

While the pastor will preferably not be the chairman of this board or cabinet, he will be its executive officer, its expert adviser, and its prophetic inspirer. He will do all he can to carry his board with him, but will never coerce or play politics to win a point. The board will have confidence in his fairness and his willingness to submit all important matters to their judgment and abide by their decisions.

Some changes in traditional church polity may be necessary in order to make the board or cabinet representative of the whole constituency and of varied interests. Since the church as a school is a graded organization, each main age group department at least from later childhood up should be represented on it both by leaders and students.

Organizations having outside overhead affiliations should be represented on the board. But they must become fully responsible to it also and recognize their allegiance to outside overhead control as always subordinate to their allegiance to the local church and its program. The church should wholeheartedly support missionary agencies and other causes, but its strongest support will ultimately depend upon the development of a well-rounded and unified program for its own constituency. Its support to these interests must be permitted in a way consistent with its own congregational plans, interests, and programs.

---

[4] The general International Standard on "The Educational Work of the Church" (in preparation, 1930) would form an excellent guide to such a study.

This board or cabinet should provide for the fullest of democratic participation by representatives of all interests, but it must insist upon their responsibility to it and upon the principle of a well co-ordinated and efficient program.

The proceedings of this board, if properly conducted, constitute in and of themselves one of the most valuable and fruitful phases of the whole curriculum of Christian living. Here will be the finest practice in creative group thinking and co-operative group action on real projects of church life. While the board or cabinet, therefore, is a means of responsible and yet democratic direction and control, it is also in and of itself educationally and spiritually indispensable in developing group morale and techniques of co-operative Christian activity.

A pastor might well be congratulated if in a period of five or seven years he could discover and develop the personnel of a staff of teachers and officers of the church who would function on this high plane of Christian churchmanship. With his pulpit, his leadership training classes, and his general supervisory contacts, he ought to be able to do it if he works definitely and consistently to that end.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beaven, A. W., *Putting the Church on a Full Time Basis*, New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc.

Betts, George H., *How to Teach Religion*, The Abingdon Press, Chapter VI.

Betts, George H., *The New Program of Religious Education*, The Abingdon Press, Chapter VIII.

Bower, W. C., *Religious Education in the Modern Church*, Saint Louis: Bethany Press, Chapter III.

Bower, W. C., *The Curriculum of Religious Education*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, Chapters IV, VIII, XV.

Coe, George A., *What Is Christian Education?* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, Chapter XI.

Fiske, G. Walter, *Purpose in Teaching Religion*, New York: The Abingdon Press, Chapter XIV.

Lotz, Philip Henry, *Current Weekday Religious Education*, The Abingdon Press, Chapters I, III, IV, VII.

McCallum, W. C., *The Graded Church*, Saint Louis: Bethany Press.

Munro, Harry C., *The Church as a School*, Saint Louis: Bethany Press, Chapters III, X, XI.

Powell, Wilfred E., *The Growth of Christian Personality*, Saint Louis: Bethany Press, Chapters VII–X.

Shaver, Erwin L., *Present-Day Trends in Religious Education*, Boston: The Pilgrim Press, Chapters VII, VIII, IX.

Soares, Theodore G., *Religious Education*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Chapters VII–IX, XIV–XV.

Vieth, Paul H., *Teaching for Christian Living*, Saint Louis: Bethany Press.

CHAPTER X

THE PASTOR HIS OWN EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR

As long as we think of the educational work of the church as merely one of several minor functions to be assigned to a specialized subordinate agency it is easy to conceive of the pastor as having comparatively little to do with it. It is natural to think of a special director for this branch of the church's program. In the absence of financial support for an employed director, the next best arrangement would appear to be to enlist some earnest layman who will give lavishly of his time and energy, and to place this work under his direction. This is the characteristic manner in which its educational task is undertaken by the church at present.

The moment that we conceive of Christian religious education, however, not as a special duty toward the young or as one particular means of church membership recruitment, but, rather, as the basic method by which the church undertakes to realize any of its legitimate and worthy aims, we see that its educational program is so intimately related to its total program that the two become indistinguishable. There is but one program. It is the total program of and for the whole church and it is soundly educational in the broad sense throughout. The church becomes a school in Christian living and its only program is one of educational aims and methods. It is inconceivable to separate the pastor from any phase of this program. It is his responsibility and concern throughout.

To be sure, he may require employed assistance in carrying it out. If the church is medium sized, he ought to have full-time professional help; if the church is large, such aid will be indispensable. The first assistance he will need is secretarial or office help, efficient, well-trained, and consecrated to Christian service. Beyond that he will likely call technically trained help for some particular phase of the total work. It may be a home visitor to carry much routine pastoral calling. It may be a children's specialist to supervise the total program in the younger grades. It may be a young people's specialist, though caution is needed here to maintain a unified total program for youth, including churchmanship and a church-centered consciousness. In a large church all three types of assistance may be needed.

The chief concern in providing such assistance must be to maintain still a thoroughly unified program. This means that the pastor dare not "turn over" any phase of the work to one of these helpers in the sense that he washes his hands of it. Few pastors would be tempted so to dispose completely of their pastoral calling. Yet that would be just as reasonable and expedient as to dispose of their responsibility to children completely by calling a children's worker. On the assumption that the pastor has adequately prepared himself by special training to direct a program which is thoroughly educational in method and viewpoint throughout, the total program ought to remain under his supervision even though specialists carry large responsibility in certain phases of it.

The relationship between the pastor-director and these specialist helpers should be clearly understood by all concerned. Obviously, it would be folly to secure a skilled specialist in children's work and then so dominate her or limit her initiative and freedom that advantage could not be taken of those very qualities for which she was called. Presumably she knows children's work better than the pastor does, for it is her specialty. But the pastor knows the total program of the church better than she does, for it is his responsibility. Complete freedom should be given her in developing and directing the children's total program within the limits determined by the policies and aims of the entire church program. When she reaches those limits, she should recognize the larger interests at stake and adjust her own method and program to them. She ought, however, to have a real share also in determining those general policies and aims within the limits of which she must work.

In the vast majority of churches, however, this problem of the co-ordination of the work of a specialist with that of the pastor will never arise, for the pastor will be the only professional leader whom they can or will afford. How to organize his activities and control his time so that he can give to his entire program that professional direction for which he is responsible, is perhaps even a bigger problem, and to it we must address ourselves. Again, we are assuming that no pastor, upon the basis of the ordinary seminary training and pastoral experience alone will undertake to give professional direction to a program which is soundly educational in method and viewpoint. These suggestions are based upon the assumption that the pastor accepting them as a guide in his own procedure has undergone special religious educational training as well.

We are thinking chiefly, therefore, of the situation in which the pastor heads his total program and has only voluntary workers through whom to carry out the leadership activities throughout the program. His staff of workers will consist of his board of officers, his various administrative leaders, and his teachers or leaders of program activities, all of them voluntary workers giving but a margin of their time and doing this as a means of Christian service rather than for any remuneration.

The term generally used in public education for the function with which we are dealing is "supervision." It is unsatisfactory for our use for two reasons. It has acquired certain connotations restricting it to improvement of classroom instruction alone, which is far too narrow a conception. Also it has certain implications of authority and domination which are very objectionable because they stimulate wrong attitudes on the part of both the teacher and the so-called supervisor.

The aim of the function under discussion here is to improve the quality of the total learning-teaching process. The method is not so much one of giving directions or criticizing or overseeing as it is one of helping, co-operating, and counseling. The leader works not so much from above as he does alongside of those whose work he seeks to improve. In fact, such relationships should exist as will thoroughly suppress the whole question of rank or authority.

The methods and instruments available for the improvement of the total learning-teaching process in a program as comprehensive and complex as that of the church are many. It is certain, however, that these will undergo much development and expansion within the near future, for the whole movement to introduce scientific method into religious work is in its infancy. In fact, there is not in print, at the time of this writing, anything comprehensive or thorough dealing with these methods and instruments, although very promising works are in preparation.

The best instrument to begin with is the church-school standard. Out of several years of wide experimentation the International Council of Religious Education has developed a very satisfactory system of standards. These are in the form of a detailed description of the educational situation or process which is ideal, together with means and directions for scoring or evaluating a given situation or process. They function as a measure of the present program and a reliable and stimulating guide to its continuous improvement.

The Educational Work of the Church[1] deals in a comprehensive way with the total church program from the educational viewpoint.

Standard A for the Sunday Church School is for use in the Sunday program of the church school in which numbers, equipment, and leadership make possible a fairly well organized program.

Standard B for the Sunday Church School is adapted to the situation in which limited equipment and leadership make necessary a somewhat less desirable organization of the program.

---

[1] In discussion-outline form, 1930.

There are standards for the departments or age-group programs as follows: Beginners (4, 5); Primary (6, 7, 8); Junior (9, 10, 11); Adolescent[2] (12–23); Intermediate[3] (12, 13, 14); Senior[3] (15, 16, 17); Young People[3] (18–23); Adults[2] (24, up).

There are similar standards also for the vacation session and week-day session of the church school.

A thorough understanding of these standards and their democratic adoption by the leaders involved would be perhaps the most effective initial step in a program of improvement. The serious use of these standards will introduce the other means and instruments which are available as the improvements for which they call are undertaken.

Only the first of the above instruments takes the comprehensive view of the total church program which we here advocate. The others are thoroughly consistent with it, but still assume that the various sessions of the church school are more or less separate from other aspects of the church program, and that a plan of improvement may be undertaken by their leaders without awaiting the adoption of the educational method and viewpoint by the church as a whole. With the pastor himself committed to the educational approach, however, there is no reason why the basic instrument used for guidance in any situation should not be *The Educational Work of the Church.* It could be supplemented by the others as they apply, and thus effective and detailed guidance supplied for much of the program.

---

[2] In experimental form, 1930.

[3] Contemplated, 1930.

These general standards having been adopted, it will be found that the first emphasis should be given to the improvement of the leadership. This is basic to every other improvement.

A systematic leadership-training program will need to be launched. The denominational leadership-training office, or that of the International Council of Religious Education if the undertaking is interdenominational, will gladly furnish information on request.

The Standard Leadership Training Curriculum is probably the best means of training leaders already in service. It provides a great variety of courses including general principles, methods, and materials, and also special work for leaders of each age-group. Each course is a unit of work (not simply a textbook) and involves from twenty to twenty-five hours of work, half of which is spent in class discussion. A diploma is granted for twelve such units of work. Of these the following six are required of all students: A Study of the Pupil (religious educational psychology), Teaching Principles, Old Testament, New Testament, The Message and Program of Christianity, and The Teaching Work of the Church. Three may be elected from a list of varied electives. Three are taken in the field of some special function such as work with a given age-group or administration. Recognition beyond the diploma for work on the same level in certain fields is also contemplated.

The agencies available providing for this work are: correspondence courses, local church classes, and standard or accredited classes and schools. The latter are frequently interdenominational.

Those who have completed the standard curriculum requirements for a diploma and are qualified to do work on a level equivalent to the senior college and graduate courses in a first-class school, will find the Advanced Leadership Curriculum very well adapted to their needs. The pastor and other professional leaders will find these courses most stimulating and helpful.[4]

In addition to provision for leaders now in service, the training program should enlist and develop a good group of prospective leaders from among the younger people. Any adequate curriculum for adolescence will include much emphasis on Christian service in the church and preparation therefor. The High School Leadership Curriculum is being developed to provide further and more definite training for this younger group of prospective leaders.[5]

An adequate local church leadership training program will be an integral part of the regular curriculum and will be continuous. It will include local classes Sunday morning as young people's electives. Similar classes will meet at another time for leaders in service. Such work should continue through at least nine months of the year, carrying general courses. There should also be participation in standard or accredited schools, particularly for specialization courses. It may be desirable so to relate local classes and standard schools that together they form a continuous program through at least nine months of the year.

---

[4] Fully explained in Educational Bulletin No. 8, which may be secured for twenty cents from International Council of Religious Education, 22d floor, 203 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

[5] Fully explained in Educational Bulletin No. 6, which may be secured for twenty cents from International Council of Religious Education, 22d floor, 203 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

The administration of this comprehensive training program may rest with a volunteer church director of leadership training. The pastor-counselor will, however, take a very active part in it, serving much of the time as a teacher of one of the classes. In no other way can he more effectively project his own personality and ideals, and exert his needed influence throughout the program. The training-class situation sets up a relationship between him and his leaders which is difficult to secure otherwise and yet is well-nigh indispensable. It goes without saying that he must be a skillful leader, demonstrating sound educational principles in his own training-class work.

A somewhat less formal method of leadership training is through the regular workers' conference and official board meetings. As the program approaches unity, these two types of meetings will tend to merge. The business and administrative details will now be carried largely through a small cabinet or executive committee. The larger group of leaders should then give their regular meetings at least in part to carefully prepared educational and devotional features for the express purpose of their own self-improvement and the development of a better quality of program. The pastor-counselor is the key person in these meetings, for it is here that he holds before his leaders collectively the ideals and goals of the total program. He is the inspirer and the fearless prophet of this group, leading them step by step to make possible, if not, indeed, inevitable, those improvements in the quality and effectiveness of the total church program which he has dreamed and previsioned.

Less formal, but no less important, will be the regular guided reading which the pastor-counselor will stimulate among his leaders. Periodicals and books will be carefully selected and supplied, and their reading related to the training-class work and the workers' conferences or board meetings.

One of the most effective ways in which self-improvement may be stimulated and guided among leaders is through the democratic working out and adoption of a self-rating scale. One pastor asked each of his leaders to state in his or her own words, after prayerful study, the ten qualifications most important for a church-school leader. An impartial but competent committee from another church then selected what they considered the best of the statements. The workers then agreed to adopt this as a personal standard for their own leadership service during the ensuing year. An excellent program of self-improvement was thus launched with the co-operation and good will of all.

The development of a self-rating scale may be undertaken in the workers' conference. Several of those in use may be secured for study and a committee assigned the task of working one out. Such a scale may well include three types of items: personality, including attitudes, leadership qualities and experience, and religious experience; training, including general education, special training, and provisions for continuous growth; performance, including dependability, immediate preparation, and skillful handling of learning-teaching situations. The formulation of such a scale will be a most stimulating enterprise. Its use ought to be a very strong factor in leadership improvement.

A major problem in the whole matter of recruiting and training an adequate leadership is that of motivation. Remuneration of workers is proving effective in a few cases, but it has also objectionable features which make it still somewhat questionable even where financially possible. The plan will doubtless be much extended, however, for phases of work which are most exacting. An unquestionable intermediate step should be faced by all churches. That is the provision in the regular church budget for the full expenses of training. This will include textbooks and other reading materials, enrollment or tuition fees, and all or a substantial part of expenses at summer leadership schools and conferences, conventions, and institutes. It would be wise to try the effectiveness of considerable investment here before going far in the direction of remuneration for nonprofessional, marginal-time Christian-leadership service. Many a church which can finance something less than an employed specialist for some part of the work would do well to underwrite an elaborate training program for its volunteer workers.

The improvement of the learning-teaching process in the school of Christian living is largely a matter of improving the leadership. Some of the pastor-counselor's most effective influence, however, will be exerted directly upon the processes or program elements themselves, or at least from the viewpoint of working upon them directly rather than on the leadership.

Public education has made rapid progress through the application of standardized tests and measurements to the outcomes or results toward which it has aimed. Industrial and commercial processes have been wonderfully increased in efficiency by this same self-critical, scientific attitude and method. While efficiency engineering has often degenerated into a mere mechanizing of human activities, it has in many cases greatly increased the productivity of a given investment of energy and effort by eliminating waste motion and placing the methods and techniques of the skilled worker at the service of the novice. Accurate testing is the only sure basis for selecting the best method or process from among those which are less effective.

The pastor-counselor is a spiritual engineer, eager always to supplant the merely good by the best, and intolerant of any method or process which wastes his precious raw material or produces an inferior output. Having determined in advance what outcome each aspect of his program should yield, he will be continually seeking reliable means of testing the results to ascertain the degree of success and to discover needed changes. While the real product of spiritual engineering is for the most part so intangible as to elude objective measurement, there are concomitant outcomes or manifestations which serve as a fair indication of the real outcomes.

It is the purpose of a worship program on the theme of "Fair Play to Our Foreign Neighbors" to bring the worshipers first of all into conscious fellowship with God, to lead them into an experience of real communion with him. On the basis of this experience it is the further purpose to get them to share God's attitude toward their neighbors of another race—an attitude of good will, appreciation, and helpfulness.

The real test of this worship program will come, of course, the next time the given individual, or the group, is in a situation involving actual relationships with those of another race in which the unchristian attitude would likely vary widely from the Christian attitude. It is impossible to set up such a test under scientific control without merely setting a trap or creating an artificial situation. It is impossible to prove that any desirable outcome observed is due to the worship program. A genuinely objective scientific test is, therefore, seemingly impossible.

However, by skillfully guided conversation with the students, by hypothetical attitude tests, and by general observation of situations involving the attitudes under question, something considerably more reliable than a guess may be made as to the effectiveness of the worship experience.

During the program itself the observer can judge in a general way as to its effectiveness. Attention, evident interest, and emotional response are indicated by bodily attitude and facial expression. There is no way to prove that the most reverent-looking individual is having the deepest experience of communion with God. In general, however, the reverent attitude is a concomitant of that experience. The fact that scientific objective tests of the desired outcomes are difficult or impossible to devise and administer, ought not to deter us from making the fullest use of every means available for assuring ourselves that we are really getting somewhere.

The pastor-counselor will lead his staff to define very specifically the outcomes which they seek, and then to use the best means available to test their success. The self-critical, evaluating attitude will be deliberately cultivated in all his own work.

A pastor in a church of about one hundred and fifty members made it his practice to participate, usually simply as a worshiper, in the department program of one of the age groups in his church school each Sunday morning. During the class period he visited some one class for its entire session, again taking his place with the students and fitting in as unobtrusively as possible. In this way he got around in each department about twice a quarter and in each class about twice a year. He knew every child by name, and his visit to class or department made a "red-letter day" for most of the children and young people.

But these visits, though unheralded, were not mere incidents or accidents. They were part of a thorough system of counseling. During the ensuing week he called on the department leader and the teacher whose work he had observed. In an encouraging and constructive way they talked over together the program, noticing first its strong features and indications of success. It was usually unnecessary for him to bring up the weaker parts of the program, for the leader was conscious of them, or could be made so by tactful questions. Together they faced the problem of improving these weak spots. Perhaps he handed the leader a book or magazine article with a marked passage, asking her to read it and give her opinion later as to its workableness. As far as possible the leader worked out her own solutions to these problems. He helped her to discover and define them. He opened to her many sources of help. He stimulated experiments and eagerly watched their outcome. His teachers and leaders were never discouraged, but they were never quite satisfied either.

These conferences with each teacher were the occasion for talking over the students one by one, and the homes from which they came. Special problems of irregularity or wrong attitudes were faced. It would have been impossible for him to disentangle his "pastoral work" from this counseling function. One was largely based on and a real part of the other. Much of the preaching to the adult membership of this church was stimulated and guided by this same source of information regarding needs and problems. Here was a man who was pastor of his whole church. It was actually thrilling to see its results in the upsurging of young life into the total program of that church. Unlike many churches also, youth and adulthood were knit together in bonds of sympathy and fellowship which were mutually enriching.

Once the pastor has qualified himself with the necessary technical knowledge and skill, and has disciplined his spirit into the fine art of sympathetic counseling, the observation of units of the program followed by friendly but frank conference with the leader will become one of his chief methods of pastoral work.

No worthy pastor would knowingly turn his pulpit over to whomsoever "kindly consented" to fill it, regardless of how ineffective the visitor's message might be, or how uncertain he was of its purpose and content. The pastor rightly guards carefully what is said from his pulpit in order to be certain that it is both effective in presentation and consistent with his purpose for his church.

As a matter of fact, however, these pulpit utterances for the most part fall on the ears of adult Christians whose major convictions are already established, and who are well qualified to be on their guard against "strange doctrines" or vain exhortations. It is not likely much harm will befall them from the pulpit, although they might, of course, lose interest and stop coming.

But the children and youth who swarm the classrooms of the church have no such defenses against ineffective or erroneous teaching. For all the ordinary minister may know, they are gaining in his church school all sorts of grotesque religious ideas and attitudes. Or the whole thing may be so uninteresting that they are resolving to "cut it out" as soon as they are old enough to do as they please on Sunday. Why the responsible spiritual leader of a congregation should guard his pulpit but ignore the desks of dozens of teachers is difficult to understand. Once he sees his full responsibility as a pastor his first concern will be "Feed my lambs." Such observation and counseling as we have described is his most effective method, if he is qualified to use it.

The attitude of self-criticism ought not to be restricted merely to class work and worship services. Every program element undertaken ought to be launched in this spirit. In planning a class party or a church-school picnic or a church-night program or an athletic contest, the question throughout the preparation should be, "Just what definite religious values am I seeking for the group in this enterprise?" Plans should provide for those values whether of worship, appreciation, knowledge, attitudes, fellowship, service, or just a sheer wholesome good time.

After each such program there should be a checking over in candid self-criticism to discover where the strong points were, the weak points, and the reasons for each. This testing of the actual outcome as far as it can be observed, by the desired outcome, introduces the scientific spirit. Care should be taken to define the desired outcomes beforehand in responses or situations so concrete that they can be observed and evaluated. This may seem at first like an academic procedure, but if seriously attempted, its influence in improving program elements and features will be amazing.

The pastor-counselor will seek improvement in his total program by seeing to it that the best available materials are in use by his workers and that these materials are so organized as to promise a unified and cumulative experience for the students.

He will be familiar with the worship materials being learned and used in the younger departments. He will see to it that the adults have sufficient appreciation for these materials to make appropriate the use of them when the younger groups are expected to participate in the general church worship service. He will select with great care some common materials so universal in their message and appeal that the whole congregation can learn them and use them together. Other and much larger resources of materials will be organized in graded form for use in age-groups only.

He will be thoroughly familiar with the general outline of the classwork curriculum used throughout the school. This background will be indispensable in planning the general programs and in counseling the workers throughout. Guidance to groups having special needs and to leaders who want "something different" can be given intelligently only on the background of this general knowledge of the total curriculum.

It will be the concern of the pastor-counselor also to see that the program in its various aspects has the best available physical setting. He should know what good equipment is and how to make the fullest use of that which is available, if, as usual, it is limited. The pastor alone is in a position to see without bias the total needs in the light of the total resources. It is he who will convince a selfish adult group that their choice room should be fitted up and turned over to a needy children's group. It is he who will persuade the men's class to judge the spiritual efficacy of underground atmosphere by actually trying it out. It will be his vision and his prophetic pleas in pulpit and conference that will tap the resources from which better equipment will come. If a platoon use of limited equipment promises a fuller use of it and a richer program, it will be his leadership that meets the objections to the new idea, and carries enough leaders with him to put it into effect experimentally. In so far as the quality of the program is determined by its physical setting the pastor-counselor will seek constant improvement.

Thus the plans by which the pastor-counselor will undertake to direct the entire program of his church and to serve without discrimination his entire constituency include quite a variety of means and methods. Each of these, instead of being another task or duty loaded upon an already overburdened mind and heart and body, is rather an effective modern tool put into the hands of one who has been laboring bare-handed at an insuperable task.

It is quite obvious, however, that a redefinition of the minister's functions is involved. His pulpit ministry will have a much closer relation to a total program. Much of his preaching will be to inform and inspire his adult constituency regarding the larger program and to interpret it to them, enlisting the resources of their service and financial support.

Perhaps statements from ministers who are also responsible for the educational programs of their churches will make more concrete what this redefinition of functions means.

The Rev. Walter H. Riley, of the Federated Church, Columbus, Nebraska, in writing about his relationship to young people's work, starts out by saying:

> First of all, in our church the minister is also superintendent of the church school. Since the school is departmentally organized, he is relieved of the task of presiding at any service on Sunday. His duties really comprise three major activities, those belonging respectively to the superintendent, the director of religious education, and pastor. He is all three, and this gives him intimate and constant contact with the department of high-school boys and girls, and also with the lower grades, from which this department is annually recruited.

The Rev. Paul Haskell, of the Community Congregational Church, Elburn, Illinois, describes his relationships and activities as follows:

As pastor of the church I am also director of religious education, which, by the way, is provided in our constitution. In this position I have supervision of all religious education projects conducted by the church, and am chairman of the religious education committee.

We younger ministers regard a great part of our pastoral and pulpit work as heading up directly under this department, but aside from this, located as I am in a village-rural situation, a considerable amount of teaching and directing falls upon me. Let me indicate what these activities are:

1. Class of young men Sunday morning.

2. Adult leader of Pilgrim League meeting every Sunday evening—high-school group.

3. Adult leader of Christian Century Club meeting once a month on Sunday P. M.—older young people.

4. Teaching one group in week-day religious education, seventh and eighth grades. This group began as a pastor's class about a year ago, but has meetings regularly after school for one hour and for religious instruction.

5. I give personal attention to two boys' groups meeting each once a week; Scouts and Junior Pioneers; also go with Mrs. Clark to smaller nearby community which is connected with us and there conduct a mixed group of grade children—varied program. Mrs. Clark gives personal attention to Camp Fire and Junior girls' groups.

Mr. Clark then describes extensive leadership training work in which he engages not only for his own workers but on a much wider basis, serving a number of communities. His active leadership in this enterprise inspires a large and fruitful participation on the part of his own church leaders. As further evidence of the pastor's important responsibility in religious education, Mr. Clark cites the fact that he serves as a member of the Illinois Council of Religious Education and also on the State Educational Committee of his own denomination. Quite obviously here is one pastor whose work is largely educational.

The Rev. B. B. Pennington, the effective pastor of the Tulip Street Methodist Church, of Nashville, Tennessee, describes his conception of the pastor's educational function as follows:

> I suppose it might be said that I am in part a director of religious education. My pastor's assistant gives most of her time to this work and I give as much time as I can. I believe the pastor when assisted can do the work better than a full-time director of religious education could do it, especially if this means that the pastor does not keep in close touch with the work. The pastor is in charge of all the work and should give most of his efforts to religious education.

There is no hint here that the minister change his basic purpose, his passion for human betterment and for the Christlike living which will herald the coming of the kingdom of God. His poignant longing to be the means through which lives will be reborn into salvation must not be dulled. Never has his self-giving devotion to the "cure of souls" been more needed.

If, however, there have been discovered in our day some new and very effective methods and instruments through which this age-old purpose of the ministry can be far more surely and efficiently realized, the minister is the very first one who should know about them and begin to use them. Unfortunately, the modern program of Christian religious education has been and is at present being directed, used, and controlled largely by others! This is as great a misfortune for the church and its school as for the minister. It has been the sole purpose of these studies not to solve the problem for the minister or even present the outlines of a solution, but, rather, to stimulate the minister to work out his own solution in his own way. The best evidence of his ability to do this will be his patient willingness to use the educational method in accomplishing all the changes necessary to usher in a new and better order in his own church.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Artman, J. M., and Jacobs, J. A., "Basic Factors in Program Making for a Local Church," *Religious Education*, December, 1929, pp. 951–61.

Betts, George H., *How to Teach Religion*, The Abingdon Press, Chapter I.

Betts and Hawthorne, *Method in Teaching Religion*, The Abingdon Press, Chapter X.

Bower, W. C., *Religious Education in the Modern Church*, Saint Louis: Bethany Press, Chapters VIII, XII.

McKibben, Frank M., *The Improvement of Religious Education.*

McKibben, Frank M., *Intermediate Method in the Church School*, The Abingdon Press, Chapter XIII.

Moore, Anne M., *Senior Method in the Church School*, The Abingdon Press, Chapter XX.

Munro, Harry C., *The Church as a School*, Saint Louis: Bethany Press, Chapters I, IX, X, XII.

Stout, John Elbert, *Organization and Administration of Religious Education*, The Abingdon Press, Chapters VIII and IX.

Date Due

RESERVE
RESERVE
Ap 3 '42
Ap 6 '42
Ap 11 '42
Ap 18 '42
Ap 24 '42
Ag 28 '4[illegible]
My 11 '42
Ap 6 '44
F 16 '45
Je 18 '45
Je 27 '45
Mr 27 '46
Ap 10 '46
Ap 24 '46
F 3 '48
Mr 4 '48
AP 22 '48
AG 9 '48
AG 20 '48
FACULTY
JE 12 '52
FACULTY
MY 26 '53
AP 13 '54
~~DEC 14 '64~~
~~NOV 15 '65~~
~~JUN 15 1983~~

103

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01029 2870